

THE YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME XVI

1935

Edited for

The English Association

BY

FREDERICK S. BOAS

AND

MARY S. SERJEANTSON



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

56-01624

820.9 E58y 1935

Kansas City
Public Library



This Volume is for
REFERENCE USE ONLY

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 4549149 4

THE YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME XVI

1935

Edited for

The English Association

BY

FREDERICK S. BOAS

AND

MARY S. SERJEANTSON

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
1937

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Capetown Bombay
Calcutta Madras
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

Ref.
822.2
552 Y
1936

PREFACE

In this Volume of *The Year's Work* there are a few changes to which the Editors wish to call attention. Since Volume VI, dealing with the publications of 1925, Miss Dorothy Everett's chapter on Middle English has been a conspicuous feature of this annual Survey. With the constant expansion of medieval studies, Miss Everett has now found it desirable to limit her field in *The Year's Work*. Two chapters have therefore been allocated to Middle English publications. Miss Everett will fortunately continue to deal with Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate, while the linguistic Editor will be responsible for the rest of the work in Middle English, under the heading, 'Before and after Chaucer'.

In these circumstances the Editors are glad to state that the chapter on 'Philology: General Works' has been undertaken by Mr. C. L. Wrenn, of Queen's College, Oxford, University Lecturer in English Language. The chapter on 'Old English' is this year contributed by Mrs. Martin Clarke.

The present Volume contains notices of 338 books and 718 articles.

F. S. B.
M. S. S.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Archiv = Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen.
C.H.E.L. = Cambridge History of English Literature.
C.U.P. = Cambridge University Press.
E.E.T.S. = Early English Text Society.
E.L.H. = A Journal of English Literary History (U.S.A.).
Eng. Stud. = Englische Studien.
Germ.-rom. Monat. = Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift.
J.E.G.P. = Journal of English and Germanic Philology.
L.Mer. = London Mercury.
Med. Æv. = Medium Ævum.
M.L.N. = Modern Language Notes.
M.L.R. = Modern Language Review.
Mod. Phil. = Modern Philology.
N. and Q. = Notes and Queries.
O.U.P. = Oxford University Press.
P.M.L.A. = Publications of the Modern Language Association
of America.
P.Q. = Philological Quarterly.
Rev. ang.-amér. = Revue anglo-américaine.
Rev. de Litt. Comp. = Revue de la Littérature Comparée.
R.E.S. = Review of English Studies.
R.S.L. = Royal Society of Literature.
S.A.B. = Shakespeare Association Bulletin (U.S.A.).
S. in Ph. = Studies in Philology.
T.L.S. = Times Literary Supplement.
Y.W. = The Year's Work.

CONTENTS

I. LITERARY HISTORY AND CRITICISM: GENERAL WORKS	7
By B. IFOR EVANS, M.A., Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of London (Queen Mary College).	
II. PHILOLOGY: GENERAL WORKS	30
By C. L. WRENN, M.A., University Lecturer in English Language in the University of Oxford.	
III. OLD ENGLISH	66
By DAISY E. MARTIN CLARKE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Hugh's College, Oxford.	
IV. MIDDLE ENGLISH. I. CHAUCER, GOWER, AND LYDGATE	91
By DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.	
V. MIDDLE ENGLISH. II. BEFORE AND AFTER CHAUCER	120
By MARY S. SERJEANTSON, M.A., D.Phil., Reader in English Language in the University of London (Westfield College)	
VI. THE RENAISSANCE	160
By FREDERICK S. BOAS, LL.D., D.Lit., F.R.S.L.	
VII. SHAKESPEARE	175
By ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A., Professor of Dramatic History and Criticism, and Chairman of the Department of Drama in Yale University, U.S.A.	
VIII. ELIZABETHAN DRAMA	199
By FREDERICK S. BOAS.	
IX. THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE	225
(1) <i>The Later Tudor Period.</i> By A. K. McILWRAITH, M.A., D.Phil., Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Liverpool	
225	
(2) <i>The Earlier Stuart Age and the Commonwealth.</i> By L. C. MARTIN, B.Litt., M.A., Professor of English Literature in the University of Liverpool	
248	

X. THE RESTORATION	265
By F. E. BUDD, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer on English Literature, Queen Mary College (University of London).	
XI. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	282
By EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A., F.R.S.L., Professor of English Language in the University of Reading.	
XII. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER.	
I. 1800-1860	318
By H. V. ROUTH, D.Litt., Reader in English Language and Literature in the University of London (King's College and the School of Economics).	
(1) <i>The Romantic Revival</i>	318
(2) <i>The Victorian Era</i>	327
XIII. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER. II.	333
By H. V. ROUTH.	
XIV. BIBLIOGRAPHICA	348
By HARRY SELLERS, M.A., of the British Museum.	
INDEX	363
By GWENDOLEN MURPHY, M.A.	

I

LITERARY HISTORY AND CRITICISM: GENERAL WORKS

By B. IFOR EVANS

THE works that fall within this chapter are of such a varied nature that it is necessary to divide them somewhat arbitrarily into certain categories. The most convenient divisions have been found to be (i) general criticism and literary history, (ii) the criticism of poetry with works on metric, (iii) the history and criticism of drama, (iv) the history and criticism of prose works, (v) collected papers, (vi) anthologies, (vii) miscellaneous works.

It has been frequently noted in this chapter that in recent years there have been few discussions of principles in literary criticism as compared with the many studies of single authors or aspects. This year, while there is no outstanding contribution to record in this section, a number of works have appeared of a general nature and all in a degree serviceable. C. Alexander has attempted a survey¹ of the literature contributed by Roman Catholic authors in England from 1845. His study begins, naturally, with the work of Newman, and its first section includes Aubrey de Vere, Stephen Hawker, Coventry Patmore, and Gerard Manley Hopkins. He sees Catholic literature in this period as a 'protest against the course being followed by European society'. In the eighteen-nineties with Alice Meynell, Lionel Johnson, Francis Thompson, and others he discovers a group of Catholic writers who obtained a wider recognition from their contemporaries: 'they were even accorded a measure of leadership by those who were rapidly losing their faith in nineteenth-century civilization.' Finally he surveys the work of the numerous contemporary writers who have given adherence to the Catholic faith. Here he finds 'the Catholic Church firmly established in the modern consciousness', and upheld by

¹ *The Catholic Literary Revival*, by Calvert Alexander. Coldwell. pp. xv + 399. 11s.

many, who are not Catholics themselves, as the one alternative to Communism. Such a study fills a gap in our literary history. Unfortunately the popular style of the present volume limits its usefulness to the student, and the absence of any clearly defined literary standards in criticism tends to obliterate all distinctions between the great and the mediocre. Alexander seems satisfied with a writer once he has discovered a concurrence in belief, and at times he is not free from the special pleading which one associates with the coterie critic. The volume is furnished with reading lists, though these might well have been more numerous and complete.

Norman Hurst has attempted to make a contribution² to literary criticism by the discovery of a new terminology 'wider and deeper than the classifications commonly used', and yet not 'too rigid or intellectual', which will bring into some order within the mind the 'infinitely varied expressions' of literature. He has four primary terms in his criticism. The first he describes as the 'outer', or the recognition of an external world and a belief that it can be reproduced, an impulsion which leads often towards realism. In opposition to this first awareness he discovers the 'inner' or the recognition of a world apart from an external world, within the individual consciousness and not controlled by concepts of space and time. Further, he employs the terms 'energy' and 'balance', neither of them capable of brief definition though corresponding at times to the conceptions usually held of 'romanticism' and 'classicism'. Often he discovers the four elements in combination in literature, and some of his most mature writing is devoted to the effects so produced. It is as difficult in literature, as in any other activity of the human mind possessive of a long tradition, to formulate a new creed or to gain acceptance for new formularies. We cannot easily forget our old terms, however inadequate they may be proved to be. The value of Hurst's volume lies not so much in the invention of a new critical vocabulary, as in the freshness of outlook, which the reconsideration of critical terms has brought into his work. His study is sensitive and suggestive,

² *Four Elements in Literature*, by Norman Hurst. Longmans, Green. pp. xix + 192. 6s.

and, though much of it was first written as a thesis, the mark of that academic Cain has been almost entirely obliterated.

Oliver Elton has devoted the Ludwig Mond lecture to *The Nature of Literary Criticism*.³ As ever, he brings to his theme an obvious delight in literature, with a judicial attitude to its controversies. 'Criticism', he maintains, 'is neither historical study, nor scholarship, nor poetic, nor a branch of psychology, although it uses all these instruments and cannot get far without them.' Nor are the critics of one type, and we should be content to see them employed in their varied disciplines. Of particular interest are his paragraphs on the critic's power to preserve or restore literary reputations and on the actor's part as a critic of drama.

Carl van Doren, in a short monograph,⁴ attempts to show how American literature differs from others. He comments that American literature, unlike that of Europe, is younger than the art of printing. It begins not with legends and verse but with prose, with reports, and with news: 'American literature has never quite ceased being news from the New World to the Old.' His main theme is the survey of the gradual recognition gained by American writers in Europe, and then, later, their development of an independence of European standards. He gives succinct accounts of the outstanding figures to confirm his general argument. His study begins with Jonathan Edwards and the literature of the colonial age, and develops into a consideration of the 'cosmopolitan' American writers, Washington Irving, Emerson, Melville, and Poe, who were indebted to Europe and accepted by Europe. This was the classical age of American literature, and it remains the period which has attracted the widest attention from foreigners. Even Franklin, Hawthorne, and Thoreau, who were in many ways more intimately American, were closely in contact with European standards. Van Doren then portrays, through Walt Whitman

³ *The Nature of Literary Criticism*, by Oliver Elton. Manchester Univ. Press. pp. 26, 1s. 6d.

⁴ *What is American Literature?* by Carl van Doren. Routledge. pp. viii + 141. 3s. 6d.

and Emily Dickinson, strangely contrasting personalities, the development of distinguishable American values in literature; meanwhile 'Mark Twain', finding that America lacked a folklore, proceeded to create one. The final phase in his study is the survey of a modern American literature, independent, sometimes aggressive, even isolationist and frequently distrustful of Europe. In the early stages of this development that great book, *The Education of Henry Adams*, played an important part. Its more recent manifestations, familiar to most readers, are outlined here with brevity but in due perspective.

Philip Henderson has written a short account of English literature.⁵ It cannot be properly described as a popular account, though it belongs to a popular series. Still less can it figure as an academic monograph, for in detail it is on occasion either misleading or inaccurate. Yet it has a distinctive quality, for it is the clearest statement in English of the Marxist interpretation of literature. For Henderson the economic interpretation of literature and a faith in the proletarian state are matters of primary concern. The whole volume is written with vigour and with an aggressive quality, which, however, seldom becomes truculent. Even the student who anathemizes the political doctrines on which this study is based may discover something of value from the freshness of outlook which Henderson's criticism frequently attains.

A volume under the editorship of Geoffrey Grigson⁶ surveys the arts from the standpoint of some of the youngest writers and critics. In 'Psychology and Art', W. H. Auden deals somewhat inconclusively with the relations of Freudian psychology to art. Louis MacNeice writing on 'Poetry' is distressingly aggressive towards the more traditional schools, but constructive in his analysis of recent experiments. Humphrey Jennings is almost wholly destructive on the 'Theatre', nor does Arthur Calder-Marshall present any more hopeful prospect in his essay on 'Fiction To-day'. Some of the best studies in the volume

⁵ *Literature*, by Philip Henderson. John Lane. pp. x+180. 3s. 6d.

⁶ *The Arts To-day*, ed. by Geoffrey Grigson. John Lane. pp. xiv+301. 8s. 6d.

are on themes only indirectly related to literary studies; Edward Crankshaw on 'Music', John Grierson on 'The Cinema', and John Summerson on 'Architecture'.

In a compact monograph⁷ H. V. Routh attempts to estimate the degree to which literature in the nineteenth century and at the present time has been able to interpret man's changing political and economic status. Of necessity, such a survey has to exclude certain aspects of literature, though in the nineteenth century most of the major figures were involved in some consideration of social problems. Routh recognizes that imaginative literature has a distinct function: 'poems, essays, novels, and plays liberate the wilful, personal, private part of our natures, which civilization threatens to efface.' His study begins with the early nineteenth century and with the increasing disillusionment expressed by creative writers on the possibilities of the industrial age. The teachings of Ruskin and Arnold are examined in some detail, while later and even contemporary figures are included in the survey.

The year has been productive of a number of *instruments de travail*. Outstanding is the publication by the Warburg Institute of a German bibliography⁸ of the survival of the Classics. The volume is published with two title-pages. The German version has one word, 'kulturwissenschaftliche', which is not rendered into English. The term was employed by Professor Warburg to describe his ideal of a 'comprehensive science of civilization' for which the historians of science were to work in conjunction with the students of literature, philosophy, art, and religion. In the introduction to this volume the term is considered historically in its relation to German studies and controversies. In plan, the bibliography covers all the major forms of human activity, folk-lore, religion, philosophy, law, literature, the plastic and pictorial arts, speech, calligraphy, and book-production. It incorporates the contact of the classics with Europe and with the Orient in each successive period. Each

⁷ *Money, Morals and Manners as Revealed in Modern Literature*, by H. V. Routh. Ivor Nicholson and Watson. pp. 256. 4s. 6d.

⁸ *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike*, [1931], 1934, ed. by the Warburg Institute. Cassell. pp. xxii + 333. 21s.

item listed is accompanied with a brief bibliographical description, a summary of contents, and a critical review. The volume is listed among the publications of the Warburg Institute for 1931, and its late appearance (1934) was not 'due merely to unfavourable times' but 'to the necessity of finding a tenable principle of arrangement and collaboration which, without infringing upon the rights of individual themes and reviewers, would bring out clearly the relation of each part to the whole'. The present volume is to be supplemented later by subsequent volumes and by a catalogue of the Warburg Institute. The editors, in their introduction, are generous to the results of English work in the same field, but nothing previously produced can compete with the plan envisioned, and in part fulfilled, by the co-operate effort of the present volume.

One of Sir Walter Raleigh's dreams used to be of a complete series of *Annals* of English literature, with the full publications listed under each year. Those endless volumes must remain as a Platonic idea of an index of English literature, but meanwhile the Oxford Press issues the earthly counterpart of the image.⁹ J. C. Ghosh has contrived to produce in one volume for the years from 1547 to 1925 a selected list of publications entered chronologically under the successive years. The reader is thus able to see at a glance the main literary output of any given year, along with a record from earlier and later years of the literary environment of the period. Further, a well contrived and detailed index allows one to trace out the complete work of any given author and to view it in relationship to the performances of his contemporaries. The format is well contrived for clarity, and the selection has been excellently managed. That the work serves a useful purpose to certain students can be seen from its almost immediate republication.

Frederic Ewen has produced a detailed and comprehensive study¹⁰ of the reputation of Schiller in England. He adopts as a starting-point the year 1788 when Henry Mackenzie introduced Schiller to English readers. Throughout the Romantic

⁹ *Annals of English Literature*. O.U.P. pp. vi+340. 8s. 6d.

¹⁰ *The Prestige of Schiller in England, 1788-1859*, by Frederic Ewen. Columbia Univ. and O.U. Presses. pp. xiii+287. 15s.

period he finds that attention attached mainly to Schiller's early works: 'he was pre-eminently the author of *The Robbers*, *Cabal and Love*, and *The Ghost-Seer*.' A change came in 1813 after the publication of Madame de Staël's *Germany*, and her insistence that Schiller was 'the minister of high idealism, a philosopher, a thinker of amplitude, and what is perhaps more important, an impeccable character'. This conception Ewen finds expressed for English readers in Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*. Bulwer's *The Poems and Ballads of Schiller* attempts even to elevate this conception of character to one approaching 'saint-hood'. Finally, in the middle of the century, a more tutored and intelligent criticism developed and the competing claims of Goethe gained more adequate attention. In 1855, with the appearance of G. H. Lewes's *Life of Goethe*, Schiller comes to take his 'rightful place immediately below Goethe'. Ewen's monograph, of which this is only the most general outline, is worked out in great detail and is equipped with an excellent bibliography.

E. J. Simmons has performed a notable service in a survey¹¹ of the contacts of English literature and culture with Russia from 1553 to 1840. From the middle of the sixteenth century, when Ivan the Terrible first developed contacts with England, to the reign of Catharine II, the main intercourse between England and Russia was commercial. Still commerce led to cultural and social interchanges, more numerous than is sometimes imagined. Simmons is able to record among many other instances that George Turberville was the secretary of a mission to Russia and recorded a land 'where the bedding is not good and the bolsters are but bad'. Further, the plays of the English players on the continent found their way ultimately and with many modifications into Russia: Simmons notes for 1674 the production of *Temir Aksakovo, a Play or 'Small Comedy' on Bajazet and Tamberlane*, which he regards as derived from Marlowe through 'some wrenched German version'. From the eighteenth century the material allows Simmons to concentrate more directly on literary influences, and the names of Milton,

¹¹ *English Literature and Culture in Russia (1553–1840)*, by E. J. Simmons. Harvard Univ. and O.U. Presses. pp. viii + 357. 15s.

Richardson, Fielding, and Ann Radcliffe appear. Russia took kindly, too, to English sentimentalism, and Thomson, Young, Ossian, and Sterne had their vogue. The reputation of the Romantics in Russia has already been the subject of separate studies, but Simmons deals in detail with the profound influence of Scott and Byron. He has also a separate study of Shakespeare's contact with the Russian stage and with Russian literature. This admirable volume has an apparatus of notes, and detailed bibliographies which include the numerous contributions of Russian students to the subject.

Among the works on the criticism of poetry the most ambitious is Maud Bodkin's volume¹² 'addressed especially to those students of psychology and of imaginative literature who believe that something may be gained by bringing these studies into closer relation'. She bases her study on the hypothesis formulated by Jung that the emotional significance found in certain poems beyond any meaning definitely conveyed is to be attributed to the presence 'beneath the conscious response' of unconscious forces which he terms 'primordial images or archetypes'. Her analysis opens with an examination of a 'rebirth archetype' in the central stanzas of *The Ancient Mariner*. She suggests that J. L. Lowes's methods of tracing the literary associations of the imagery are insufficient. There lies also in the poem a 'pattern', commonly found in literature, and similar to that in the story of Jonah, the theme of the 'night journey' or 'rebirth'. This recurrent 'pattern' has its counterpart in the opposite, described by Freud as 'death and life instincts'. Miss Bodkin also analyses the 'Paradise-Hades' archetype and the images of 'woman', 'the devil', 'the hero', and 'God', with reference mainly to the poetry of Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Coleridge, and Shelley, and with frequent illustrations from Greek literature. Incidentally she urges that the emotional response of poetry can only be gained through 'free association and introspection'.

The main difficulty encountered by the reader of this volume is to decide whether psychology is being used to serve literature

¹² *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*, by Maud Bodkin. O.U.P. pp. xiv + 340. 12s. 6d.

or literature employed as data for psychological investigations. The author suggests as the motive for her study the discovery of the 'deeper processes involved in the response to poetry'. But it cannot be urged too often that the psychological analysis of those responses may not necessarily increase our enjoyment of literature, nor will it necessarily increase our understanding. Literary criticism has its own method, its own vocabulary, and its own ends. Miss Bodkin, suggestive though her monograph often is, seems in danger of introducing methods and processes alien to literature. Her aim seems dominated often by her psychological rather than her literary interests. It may be well to bring literature and psychology together, but the result would be disastrous if, as a consequence, literature were merged into psychology.

Only one volume on metric has been received, a study of rhythm by Sir Stanley Leathes.¹³ This brief study of the most difficult and intangible element in prosody is obviously the outcome of a generous reading in a number of literatures. The presentation of the argument lacks at times the necessary cohesion, and conclusions are occasionally reached rather by divination than by logical approach. Leathes commences his study with a note on Greek and Latin measures. Greek metre depends on number and quantity (duration in time), while the Romans adapted the Greek system in place of their native versification, which was probably stressed. English verse beginning as a stressed system was modified by Chaucer's knowledge of the 'lightly stressed' nature of French verse. Those experiments gained their ultimate expression in Shakespeare. Using the ten syllable line as a norm he incorporated elements from the English, the French, and the classical systems. He used quantity, and stress, and a lightness of stress to gain rhythm: these elements he disposed so that they 'hovered around a norm, but were seldom identical with that norm'. The method that Shakespeare evolved Milton adapted for his own purposes. Eighteenth-century verse Leathes sees as a return to the predominance of stress: 'roughly, from 1670 to

¹³ *Rhythm in English Poetry*, by Sir Stanley Leathes. Heinemann pp. vi + 154. 5s.

1820, not only in narrative, dramatic, contemplative, satiric, and descriptive poetry, but also in the lyrical verse, of our countrymen, regular stresses were predominant in metre. The stresses in this period did not become so rigid and heavy as those in German, but the framework for rhythm became less elastic.' The revolt from these restrictions Leathes finds in Keats's *Endymion* and in the work of the later romantics.

While much in this study is suggestive, one feels that the ultimate problem of rhythm still remains unexplored. It is strange, too, to find a volume on metric which leaves the *Testament of Beauty* to be 'judged by future generations'. The metrist should help us to understand the work of our contemporaries. Leathes ends his study with Swinburne and leaves Hopkins, who is vital to his whole argument, unexamined. Nor can one easily acquiesce in his judgements on earlier verse. The heroic couplet has far more rhythmical variety than his conclusions suggest, while the period 1670–1820, which he dismisses so briefly, is full of prosodic adventure and of experiment.

A number of works on dramatic history and criticism have been received. The most notable is Enid Welsford's study of *The Fool*.¹⁴ Her study opens with a survey of the professional buffoon in western Europe: 'the buffoon is neither the unconscious fool, nor the conscious artist who portrays him; he is the conscious fool who shows himself up, chiefly for gain, but occasionally at least for the mere love of folly.' He is 'morally subnormal but not mentally deranged': his 'acknowledged defects are socially acceptable as a source of entertainment'. Along with the historical buffoons she considers the mythical figures created out of the popular imagination, the Arabian Si-Djoha, who in Sicily became Giufa; Marcolf, 'the ungainly peasant who outwitted Solomon'; Scogin, who in England inherited Marcolf's jokes; Till Eulenspiegel and others. She discovers a development in the court fool who causes amusement not 'merely by absurd gluttony, merry gossip, or knavish tricks, but by mental deficiencies or physical deformities'. The retention of fools and of madmen and dwarfs in noble houses seems obscure, though Miss Welsford carries her examination

¹⁴ *The Fool*, by Enid Welsford. Faber and Faber. pp. xv + 374. 21s.

back as far as the Pharaohs, and down to a consideration of the Hunferth episode in *Beowulf* and to the Irish 'fili'. Her view is that grotesque figures were originally kept for magical or religious purposes, but that very soon, perhaps from the first, they evoked curiosity and amusement. Evidence is more ample for her examination of the medieval court-fool, whom she regards as possibly 'the result of a fusion between the Celtic and Roman fool'. The origin of a genuine interest in the personality of the court-fool enters with the Renaissance, and she examines in detail the conceptions prevalent in England. The decline of the court-fool is to be discovered in the eighteenth century, 'except in the more backward countries of Europe such as Russia'.

In a later section of her monograph Miss Welsford considers the imaginative presentation of the court-fool, and she examines the activities of the festival ring-leader, the Lord of Misrule, and surveys the 'Feast of Fools', the *Sociétés Joyeuses*, the 'Mère-Folle', the 'Infanterie Dijonnaise', the 'Cornardo' of Rouen and Évreux, the Parisian 'Enfants-sans-souci', and other fool societies. These form a link with her study of the presentation of the court-fool in literature, particularly in the '*Sottie*, a type of comedy in which the fool provided both the *dramatis personæ* and the theme'. She traces the influence of the *Sottie* on Sir David Lindsay's *Satire of the Three Estates*. She examines the German contribution, including Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff*, and shows how the fool-literature provided Erasmus in *The Praise of Folly* with a literary convention. A separate study explores the place of the fool in Elizabethan drama, though Miss Welsford finds that apart from Shakespeare this is not so notable as might be expected. The final section is an admirable account of the stage clown. The volume is well equipped with notes and bibliographies. Of its value to the student of drama no emphasis need be made here. The presentation is scholarly with the added virtues of wit and a grace in style, and the theme as presented is throughout absorbing.

Camillo Pellizzi's *Il teatro inglese* has now been translated¹⁵ by Rowan Williams. The volume opens with a general discus-

¹⁵ *English Drama*, by Camillo Pellizzi: trans. by Rowan Williams. Macmillan. pp. ix+306. 7s. 6d.

sion of the English desire for compromise: 'there genius reveals itself more in the empiric creation of realities and new situations than in the attainment of universal principles.' This preliminary matter is interesting though it is addressed primarily to an Italian audience. The more detailed study begins with the drama of the middle of the nineteenth century. Even here Pellizzi maintains an attitude independent of English traditions in criticism. His estimate of Robertson, for instance, is far lower than that of the English historians of the drama. The most significant movement he discovers in the 'social remorse' of the middle classes, which, beginning with Ibsen, found its main expression in G. B. Shaw, 'that type of *middle class anti-middle class*' to whom the greater part of the spiritual and also political life of Western civilization in the last century is due. Pellizzi also studies the dramatic work of St. John Hankin, Granville Barker, Elizabeth Baker, John Galsworthy, Harold Chapin, Harold Brighouse, and of a number of minor writers. Further, he analyses the revival of fantasy in the plays of Barrie, Masefield, Yeats, Flecker, and Dunsany, and surveys the anecdotal and historical drama of Laurence Housman and John Drinkwater. He has incorporated into his work an account of the Irish theatre from the early work of Lady Gregory to the 'new realism' of Sean O'Casey, and he has a brief but discriminating summary of the activities of the American theatre. His concluding chapter considers contemporary drama down to 1932, the date when the volume was completed in its Italian version.

F. B. Millett and G. E. Bentley have produced a volume¹⁶ intended as an introduction to the study of drama. Their aim is not to give a history of drama, but to explore the contrasting expressions of drama in different periods and to review these in relationship to the nature of the audiences and to the possibilities of dramatic technique. Thus in their first section tragedy and comedy are described from their appearance in the Greek theatre down to their production in modern times. A brief section is appended on melodrama and farce. The treatment

¹⁶ *The Art of the Drama*, by F. B. Millett and G. E. Bentley. New York: Appleton Century Co. pp. viii + 253. 8s. 6d.

has of necessity to be of a summary character throughout. This necessitates that many of the statements demand qualification. Equally it is difficult to see who can read such a compressed narration with intelligent understanding except those whose previous knowledge of the subject would make the perusal of the present volume an act of supererogation. This applies even more keenly to the second section, where the authors consider 'Dramatic Modes and Values', and review drama under such headings as 'classicism', 'romanticism', and 'sentimentalism'. Possibly the most useful section is on 'Dramatic Technique', where the authors consider the more practical aspects of dramatic presentation, a subject which has always gained more attention in America than in England. The work has no bibliography or reading lists, and frequently there are no references to the authorities quoted in the text. These omissions impair the usefulness of a volume whose right use by the student demands further and more detailed reading, and the addition of such an apparatus in a later edition would add to the value of the work.

Notable among the volumes on prose are two works on the history of journalism. *The Times* celebrates its hundred and fiftieth anniversary with an 'autobiography',¹⁷ if so intimate a term can be applied to the composite work 'of a number of past and present members of the staff of *The Times* . . . in general a body of men whose tradition and training have disposed them to anonymity'. The aim is to give the history of the journal itself, but inevitably innumerable sidelights are thrown on the literary and political history of the late eighteenth century and the nineteenth. The present volume deals with the formative period up to 1841, before the coming of Delane. The early chapters describe the beginnings of *The Times*, first published as the *Daily Universal Register* and owned by John Walter I, who regarded the paper as an appendage of his business as a bookseller. A detailed account is given of the acceptance by the whole press of the practice of receiving 'salaries'

¹⁷ *The History of The Times, 'The Thunderer in the Making', 1785-1841. Written, Printed, and Published at the Office of The Times, Printing House Square. pp. xx+515. 15s.*

for the insertion of desirable news and opinions. Gradually *The Times* won itself free from this position into a tradition of independent comment. Two personalities stand out from this early period. John Walter II, the son of the first proprietor, built up an independent news service, fought the Post Office, and enhanced the respect in which writers to daily journals were held. Further, he was the first proprietor to entrust the full control of his staff and the policy of his paper to an editor. He was fortunate in having the services of Thomas Barnes who emerges from this history as a powerful figure and one of importance in the history of journalism. The volume is amply illustrated with portraits, facsimiles, and caricatures.

While *The Times* produces the first volume of its detailed history, Kurt von Stutterheim has composed a compact and informative history¹⁸ of the English press as a whole. His early chapters give an account of news-writing in England from the Elizabethan times down to the eighteenth century. Though he is forced to brevity, his work shows the judgement of one who is familiar with his theme. The more original portion of his study deals with the modern and contemporary phases of journalistic development, particularly of the period in which the popular newspapers began to compete with the older journalistic tradition. His survey is valuable not only in its historical aspects but in its analysis of the social and national influence of the new journalism. He makes some enlightening comparisons on the contrasts between the development and organization of the press in England and in Germany.

Henry Guppy, the Librarian of the Rylands Library in Manchester, has contributed a valuable pamphlet¹⁹ on the transmission of the Bible from the earliest times down to the Revised Version of 1881–95. This monograph was written to accompany the exhibition of manuscripts and printed books in the Rylands Library on the four-hundredth anniversary of the publication of Miles Coverdale's Bible, completed in October 1535. Guppy's

¹⁸ *The Press in England*, by Kurt von Stutterheim. Allen and Unwin. pp. 223. 8s. 6d.

¹⁹ *A Brief Sketch of the History of the Transmission of the Bible, &c.*, by Henry Guppy. Manchester U.P. pp. vi+70. 2s.

study is accompanied by a number of facsimiles, and with two bibliographies: the first on 'Works for Study of Original Texts', and the second on 'Aids to the Study of Later Versions other than English'.

Mark Longaker has attempted a survey²⁰ of the 'modern school of biography'. His approach is discursive, and he has little to say of the earlier traditions of biographical writing against which the modern practitioners rebelled. Nor does he distinguish sufficiently between contemporary biographers in their knowledge, integrity, and literary skill. His survey covers in some detail the work of Lytton Strachey, A. Maurois, E. Ludwig, P. Guedalla, and Hilaire Belloc. He has further some consideration of the modern school of biography in America.

J. C. Major has printed a dissertation²¹ on the role of memoirs in English biography and fiction. He shows the development of memoirs in France and the relations between the French and English types. From this introductory study he proceeds to examine the degree to which memoir-writing anticipates the methods of modern biography, and the contribution which it makes to the portraiture of character. Further, he considers its relationship to the 'fiction of amorous intrigue in high society' and to historical fiction. The most interesting part of his work is his detailed study of the relationship of the work of Defoe to his general theme. While the terminal date of his study is 1740, he adds by way of an appendix a chapter on 'the role of the memoirs in Sir Walter Scott's historical novels'.

Among the volumes of collected papers the outstanding is the posthumous edition²² by Edna Purdie of the essays and addresses of J. G. Robertson. Should any reader need confirmation of the width and insight of Robertson's approach to the literature of western Europe he would find it amply in this volume. The most impressive section is on Scandinavian litera-

²⁰ *Contemporary Biography*, by Mark Longaker. Pennsylvania Univ. and O.U. Presses. pp. 258. 11s. 6d.

²¹ *The Role of Personal Memoirs in English Biography and Novel*, by J. C. Major. Philadelphia: Univ. of Penns. Press. pp. 176.

²² *Essays and Addresses on Literature*, by J. G. Robertson, ed. by Edna Purdie. Routledge. pp. viii + 314. 12s. 6d.

ture. The paper on Søren Kierkegaard had already been published, as had the article on Henrik Pontoppidan, but the lecture on 'Strindberg's position in European literature' appears now for the first time. In many ways this is the most interesting item in the volume, suggestive of Robertson's solidity in detail and of his wide-ranging sympathies in literature. The outstanding feature of the Scandinavian section is a series of articles on Ibsen, none of which had previously been published. They cover the whole of Ibsen's work as a poet and a dramatist and make a definite contribution to the criticism in English of Ibsen's work. German literature is naturally generously represented. The editor collects a number of Robertson's studies of individual authors, Franz Grillparzer, Gottfried Keller, Carl Spitteler, and Lessing. Further, she adds three lectures on more general themes. 'The Reconciliation of Classic and Romantic', is an historical analysis which, while founding itself on German literature, develops into a consideration of the implications for western Europe of a problem examined elsewhere by Robertson in greater detail. In 'The Eighteenth Century' he considers 'the sudden and apparently unjustified development of German poetry' in that period a phenomenon which he explains by Germany's capacity for rising to greatness by 'borrowing from her neighbours, by assimilating their ideas'. The German section concludes with Robertson's well-known Taylorian lecture on 'The Gods of Greece in German Poetry'. The editor also includes three lectures delivered by Robertson on wider themes. These are 'Literary Cosmopolitanism', 'The Spirit of Travel in Modern Literature', and 'Literature in the Universities'. They reveal more directly the principles of Robertson's criticism, implicit in all the studies in this volume, especially his belief in comparative studies, not for the sake of any eclectic pedantry but from a humanist's faith in the growth of the creative power in man from the union of elements derived from more than one national or racial culture.

Sir John Squire has issued two volumes of collected papers. In *Reflections and Memories*²³ he has brought together a number

²³ *Reflections and Memories*, by Sir John Squire. Heinemann. pp. viii + 314. 8s. 6d.

of essays most of which have been previously published. Some of these are discursive essays on general themes. Of those on literary subjects the major contribution is his introduction to the works of James Elroy Flecker, which is useful for biographical matter and from a critical standpoint still remains as the most valuable summary of Flecker's work as a poet. His brief essay on John Freeman is important mainly for personal reminiscences, as is his study of Julius West, the author of the *History of Chartism*. The volume also includes an essay on 'Dr. Johnson's contributions to other peoples' works', an interesting estimate of Johnson's dedications and prefaces; a short essay on 'Elizabethan Song', first published as a preface to an anthology; a study of Jane Austen, which originally served a similar purpose; and in conclusion an essay on 'Women's Verse'.

Sir John has also collected²⁴ two series of lectures which were originally designed for delivery to popular audiences. The first on 'the enjoyment of words' is an analysis of words in conversation, in prose, and in verse. Throughout the purpose of instruction struggles with difficulty, but usually with success, with the desire to entertain. The second series on 'the enjoyment of literary forms' finds Squire in a region where he can write simply and easily and yet with discernment and originality.

John Hampden edits an interesting symposium²⁵ of essays by contemporary writers who may be regarded as 'partners' in book production and criticism. Stanley Unwin contributes an introduction with some brief but illuminating comments on publishing. Of particular interest is his discussion of the position of the publisher in relation to the law of libel. Later in the volume he writes on 'English Books Abroad'. Frank Swinnerton writes on 'Authorship', and advances the belief that contemporary literature suffers from 'an excessive concern with either publicity or aestheticism'. D. Kilham Roberts describes the functions of 'The Literary Agent', and W. G. Taylor comments on 'Publishing'. G. Wren Howard gives a practical discussion of modern 'Book Production', and the late Gerald

²⁴ *Flowers of Speech*, by Sir John Squire. Allen and Unwin. pp. 151.
4s. 6d.

²⁵ *The Book World*, ed. by John Hampden. Nelson. pp. vii + 232. 6s.

Gould considers the function of 'Reviewing' in popular journals. J. G. Wilson writes on 'Bookselling in London'; Basil Blackwell has an entertaining essay on 'Provincial Bookselling', and J. Ainslie Thin considers the free-lance practice of the trade in 'Second-Hand Bookselling'. The volume concludes with contributions by Charles Nowell on 'The Public Library', and by F. R. Richardson on 'The Circulating Library'. The volume has much unusual information and maintains a consistent standard of interest.

Of the *Essays and Studies*, vol. xx,²⁶ of the English Association one only is on a general theme. E. M. W. Tillyard replies to C. S. Lewis's essay on 'The Personal Heresy in Criticism' (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 23). He attempts to redefine the 'personality' encountered in a work of art. The trivial or anecdotal elements in the life of an artist are unrevealing and unnecessary to criticism, but there remains, partially discovered in the creative work itself, a 'mental pattern'. Part of the satisfaction of literature is a contact with this 'pattern', which in the work of any significant artist is immediately impressive. He examines Eliot's contention that poetry is an 'escape from personality' and suggests that the escape is from 'the accidents that attend a person in everyday life': the more a poet loses himself in his work the more 'likely is the reader to hail the poet's characteristic, unmistakable self, *ipsissimus cum minime ipse*'. The position varies with each writer, from the 'fluid' personality of Shakespeare with 'an almost unexampled power of adapting itself to the shifting experiences of life' to the more 'rigid' personality of Milton. With much that Lewis had advanced in his essay Tillyard finds himself in agreement.

The Royal Society of Literature has issued another volume²⁷ of its annual transactions. This year's collection is published under the editorship of the Earl of Lytton, who in a brief introduction passes in review the work of his contributors. The contents are as usual, varied and interesting. St. John

²⁶ *Essays and Studies*, by Members of the English Association, vol. xx, ed. by George Cookson. O.U.P. pp. 151. 7s. 6d.

²⁷ *Essays by Divers Hands*, vol. xiv, ed. by the Earl of Lytton. O.U.P. for R.S.L. pp. 165. 7s.

Ervine in 'The Plays of Noel Coward' makes a serious claim for Coward as a dramatist. H. Hardy Wallis in 'James Thomson and his "City of Dreadful Night"' gives a general critical estimate of Thomson's work. W. R. Inge writes on 'Plato and Ruskin'. He shows that Ruskin was a student of Plato, and while he did not possess Plato's mysticism he was more indebted to him than to any one, except Carlyle. An attempt is made to contrast the problems which faced Plato and Ruskin and to use the comparison to estimate Ruskin's contribution to nineteenth-century civilization. Anthony Deane writes on Mark Twain, a discursive essay but composed with evident enjoyment. Robert L. Ramsey discusses 'Some English Letter Writers of the Seventeenth Century', and quotes, with comments, from the Verney Memoirs and other collections. The most impressive item in the volume is D. Nichol Smith's lecture, 'Jonathan Swift, Some Observations', which selects, for detailed examination, some salient features of Swift's verse and prose (see below pp. 313-14).

Anthologies of verse are still numerous. M. M. Gray will place many students in his debt with an anthology²⁸ of Scottish poetry from 1350 to the Union of the Crowns. His work has a brief introduction and a glossary, but it concentrates on the presentation of texts. The volume opens with a useful group of selections from Barbour's *Bruce*. *The Kingis Quair* is given in an abridged form, and *Schir William Wallace* is represented by five passages. Henryson is generously represented with a selection which includes the whole of *The Testament of Cresseid*. Dunbar appears in thirty pieces, judiciously chosen to illustrate the varied aspects of his poetical talents. Along with a number of anonymous poems selections are published from Sir David Lindsay, Alexander Scott, Sir Richard Maitland, Alexander Montgomerie, Alexander Hume, Stewart of Baldynnis, William Fowler, and James VI. Some readers might possibly have welcomed notes on the poems, but probably Gray could have inserted these only by some sacrifice of the selections which have been generously given.

²⁸ *Scottish Poetry from Barbour to James VI*, ed. by M. M. Gray. Dent. pp. xxx+385. 7s. 6d.

The most elaborate anthology of verse²⁹ this year appears under the general editorship of Charles Williams. Lord David Cecil, E. de Selincourt, and E. M. W. Tillyard have acted with him as associate editors. Two rules were laid down by the publisher for the volume: (1) it should contain nothing which was in the *Oxford Book of English Verse* or the *Golden Treasury*; (2) every poem included should be of poetic importance. The range of the volume is from the medieval lyric to the death of G. M. Hopkins. Selections are included as well as complete poems, and there are some brief but commendable biographical notes. The delimitations set by the publisher give the volume an inevitable unevenness, as if the reader were walking through a picture gallery from which the main exhibits had been removed. But he is presumed to have the other anthologies in his possession, and he has the compensation of finding new poems instead of the old exhibits. The distinguishing feature of the volume is a generous and well-chosen selection of dramatic verse mainly of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Williams has also included a number of poems which contain critical comment. The volume is certainly a worthy companion to its predecessors. Many poems here enter the world of anthology for the first time, and the selection of the verse of minor writers has been particularly well contrived.

A less ambitious work³⁰ has been produced by R. L. Mégroz, who publishes a volume of selections of dramatic verse from Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

By far the most original anthology³¹ of the year has been provided by W. H. Auden and John Garrett. Their governing principle is that 'no poetry, which when mastered, is not better heard than read, is good poetry'. This is supplemented by the belief that poetry 'can appeal to every level of consciousness', and that 'poetry is not primarily an escape from reality'. Their anthology does not aim at illustrating literary tendencies or

²⁹ *The New Book of English Verse*, ed. by Charles Williams. Gollancz. pp. 828. 7s. 6d.

³⁰ *Dramatic Verse*, ed. by R. L. Mégroz. Pitman. pp. xiii+116. 2s. 6d.

³¹ *The Poet's Tongue*, by W. H. Auden and John Garrett. Bell. pp. xxxiv+222. 6s.

influences; it tends rather to show that verse can have an interest independent of period. To further their purpose they introduce a number of ballads, folk-songs, nursery rhymes, sea-shanties, and broad-sheet verses. One may look in vain for some of the great names or for some of the pieces that have almost an hereditary claim to appearance in an anthology. The effect they gain is, however, original, without any sense of bravura or perversity. Auden has established himself as a poet, and his view of the function of poetry has an importance. This selection and its introduction illustrate his position: 'everything that we remember no matter how trivial: the mark on the wall, the joke at luncheon, word games, these, like the dance of a stoat or the raven's gamble, are equally the subject of poetry.' They become poetry once they are converted into 'memorable speech'. In some ways Auden's statement is a protest against Arnold's essay on poetry. Arnold, when he had lost his faith, led poetry up to the high altar to fill a space that was empty. Auden, who has a faith, though not the faith which Arnold at length half-discovered, would lead poetry out into the world again and let her roam where she listeth, even let her laugh if she wishes.

Cowling has prepared an 'outline'³² of English verse in the form of an anthology with an introduction. His survey covers the development of verse from Chaucer to Arnold, with selections as well as complete poems. Questions of proportion will always be in dispute in such a volume. Some will think that if Shakespeare is represented with only four sonnets and Donne with two poems, Scott, who always enjoyed broad acres, has had an over-ample terrain with four pieces, and Wordsworth over-lucky with a plot of ground large enough for fourteen selections. With the critical opinions of the introduction dissent can be based on more rational grounds. It is strange to find still the comment that 'English literature begins its triumphal progress with Chaucer', and that the centuries before are 'lacking in literary distinction apart from *Beowulf* and *Sir Gawain*'. Nor is it just to say that 'the triumphs of prose die with the

³² *The Outline of English Verse*, ed. by G. H. Cowling. Macmillan. pp. xxv+530. 6s.

convention or fashion in which they were written'. Cowling has been led, perhaps, to speak too emphatically in an attempt to sketch the history of verse in a brief introduction. The anthology can speak better for itself.

Gollancz continues to issue his anthology³³ of 'famous plays' of the year. The selection for 1935 includes *Night Must Fall*, by Emlyn Williams; *Accent on Youth*, by Samson Raphaelson; *Close Quarters*, adapted by Gilbert Lennox from *Attentat* by W. O. Somin; *Grief Goes Over*, by Merton Hodge; *The Mask of Virtue*, adapted by Ashley Dukes from *Die Marquise von Arcis* by Carl Sternheim; *Youth at the Helm*, adapted by Hubert Griffith from the German of Paul Vulpius.

A number of miscellaneous volumes have been received. P. Gurrey has written a brief study³⁴ of 'the appreciation of poetry'. His work is designed mainly for those who have 'to teach poetry', but its scholarly approach and sensitive presentation give it a value beyond this original purpose. Gurrey's main principle is that poetry is 'communication', and he analyses the integral parts of the poem which make communication possible. Throughout he keeps in mind the contemporary discussions on verse, particularly the controversy on 'meaning' in poetry.

Logan Pearsall Smith has written a pamphlet³⁵ of an openly polemical nature. His aim is to attack the contemporary critics, mainly of the 'Cambridge school', who wish to confine prose to the function of the bare and direct conveyance of a meaning. He suggests that this group regard euphony in prose and the cultivation of 'style' as decadent. He attempts to show from an historical survey how much in English prose would have been lost if these purposes had been consistently maintained. Further, he argues that the delimitations of prose and verse can never be strictly defined, and that prose can share the evocative powers of verse. It might be advanced that he never

³³ *Famous Plays of 1935*. Gollancz. pp. 622. 7s. 6d.

³⁴ *The Appreciation of Poetry*, by P. Gurrey. O.U.P. pp. 120. 3s. 6d.

³⁵ *Fine Writing*, by Logan Pearsall Smith. S.P.E. Tract XLVI. O.U.P.

fully comprehends the purposes of his antagonists, nor the condition in contemporary letters which they are attempting to combat. His purpose is not to be judicial, but to rage open warfare, as one may see from the passage in his essay which suggests that 'to be educated [at Cambridge] is now the biggest handicap an artist can be called upon to endure'.

J. M. Gover has published a lecture³⁶ on the literary associations of the Middle Temple, in which, in a pleasant discursive narrative, he recalls the names of the many men of letters who were members of the Inn. He also comments on the associations with the Middle Temple of writers such as Goldsmith and Johnson who, though they were never called, had close contact with the society.

³⁶ *Literary Associations of the Middle Temple*, by J. M. Gover. Pitman. pp. vii+35. 2s.

II

PHILOLOGY: GENERAL WORKS

By C. L. WRENN

Two bibliographical notes may conveniently be placed at the head of this chapter. A number of matters which are of interest to some students of English philology but which do not properly fall within the scope of either the Modern Humanities Research Association's *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* or *The Year's Work* are fully listed in the *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie*, although the value of this bibliography is somewhat impaired by its retarded appearance nearly three years after the period it covers.¹ Thus, for example, are included sections on general Indo-European philology, the history of Germanic philology, Runic inscriptions, &c., and the languages related to English all find a place.

The ever-increasing work of America, both in general linguistic science and in English philology, with its marked growth in periodical literature, makes the section entitled *American Bibliography for 1935* which A. C. Baugh contributes to *P.M.L.A.* (Dec. Supplement) of special usefulness: for here are to be found several items which have escaped the compilers of the bibliographical lists supplied by various periodicals such as *R.E.S.* and *M.L.R.*

Though a considerable number of books have appeared in the year under review on both sides of the Atlantic on how to use the English language for success in life, only two need be noticed here under the head of grammar before passing on to the more immediate subject-matter of this survey. For the year has given us the first attempt in English to introduce the beginner to comparative Indo-European grammar under

¹ *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie in Berlin; Neue Folge, Band XII, Bibliographie 1932. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 274. RM. 17.50. 1935.

the guidance of an experienced classical philologist, and an elaborate treatment of the English Parts of Speech and their accidence by an American scholar of repute.

T. Hudson-Williams's *Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar*² tries to give the student already possessed of a sound grounding in the classical tongues a clear sketch (in only 78 pages) of those primary facts about Indo-European —its phonology, accidence, and general character—which are so often awkwardly prefixed to OE. grammars and histories of our language. Such a book was needed, and Hudson-Williams has, on the whole, succeeded, despite the difficulties caused by extreme compression. A somewhat dogmatic presentation of disputed matters and the appearance of ignoring some recent advances in knowledge are probably inevitable in a book of this type, and a larger and more discursive work of the kind will be wished for by most readers of this pioneering attempt.

The long-expected second volume of Curme and Kurath's *Grammar of the English Language*, under the title of *Parts of Speech and Accidence*, has come from Curme, whose *Syntax* (noticed in *The Year's Work*, xii. 43) formed the third and final volume of this ambitious work.³ The first volume, on the history of the language, by Kurath, is still awaited. Curme, as is to be expected, treats English from a modern standpoint, though he uses earlier Modern English a good deal, 'as the great masterpieces of these centuries are still read'. OE. and ME. naturally only receive very occasional mention. The various verbal forms receive especially full measure of elucidation, and some attempt is made to render the whole equally useful for both American and English students. For Curme, English is 'a development reflecting our inner life and struggles'; and the living and ever-changing language of the present is fully and discursively handled. Yet the traditional grammatical terms are, for the

² *A Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar (Indo-European)*, by T. Hudson-Williams. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press. pp. xii+78. 3s. 6d.

³ *A Grammar of the English Language*, in three vols.: vol. 2: *Parts of Speech and Accidence*, by George O. Curme. Boston: Heath. pp. xiii+370. 8s. 6d.

most part, retained. As in so many recent works of American scholars, the English reader is likely to find the term 'British' as applied both to our own and the language of the United States, a source of confusion or irritation; and Curme has *Northern British*, *Southern British*, *Common British standard*, and *Current English* rather bewilderingly, for instance, on p. viii of his Preface.

The increase of English studies in many parts of the world, and especially the tendency of linguistic theorists to work in English material, necessarily make the matter of this chapter more and more heterogeneous and far-reaching. It is therefore proposed to group the material roughly under the following heads for the sake of convenience in reference, though of course no seriously systematic classification is aimed at, and there will be some overlapping: (a) linguistic theory as applied to English, (b) lexicography and etymology, (c) history of the language, (d) place-names, (e) contemporary usage, (f) *Americana*, and (g) miscellaneous.

The holding of the *Second International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* of July 1934 in London, of which J. R. Firth gives a summary report in *English Studies* (Oct.), may well remind us of the fact that the continental science of 'Phonology' has, for good or ill, come definitely to hold some place in English studies. 'Perhaps the most abstract branch of phonetics', writes Firth, 'is what is nowadays called phonology, which, quite unlike experimental phonetics does not concern itself with "sounds" or "phones" as specific speech events, but with whole systems of functioning sound-types of languages considered as wholes. It is not the science of speech sounds but the science of these functional units, or phonemes.' And he tells us that, though all the fifteen branches of phonetics had a place in the discussions, the *phoneme* was everywhere dominant. In using the term 'phonology', then, we must now distinguish between its 'old style' simple signification and this 'new style' implement of Slavonic psychological theorists and their followers: and indeed it must be even admitted that the most striking—whether or not the most permanently valuable—work of 1935 in general linguistic science has been on the phoneme. If it be asked what

has all this to do with English philologists, the reply comes in the form of B. Trnka's *Phonological Analysis of Present-day Standard English*.⁴ Here is shown the application of the theories of the School of Prague to current English in a systematic analysis of its sounds. A most useful appendix reprints the *Projet de terminologie phonologique standardisée* put forward by the Prague Phonological Conference of 1930; and this should be mastered before studying the detailed analyses, since Trnka employs the Prague terms throughout. An introductory discussion in which Trnka defines the phoneme makes clear the attitude of the writer which is fairly representative of the newest thought on the subject.

'The fundamental linguistic oppositions which cannot be analysed into smaller units are called *phonemes*. Thus in English the sounds contained in the words *hand*, *hat*, *home*, are *phonemes*, because they stand in functional opposition and are able to distinguish one word from another, e.g. *hand land*, *home comb*, *had hat*, &c. The same *phoneme* may be realized phonetically in different ways according to its combinations and positions in words, or to the styles of the language, not to mention individual shades of articulation: but yet these different realizations may go back to the same *phoneme*. For example the *phoneme* [r] in Southern standard English is pronounced differently according to its position—1, after *t*; 2, after *d*; 3, before any vowel not preceded by *t* or *d*: but these differences in the pronunciation of [r] do not constitute the oppositions able to differentiate the conceptual meaning of the words.'

In his Preface Trnka says that 'the problem of the psychological progress of understanding a language may be solved only on the basis of *phonological* (or *phonemic*) analysis'. An elaborate classification of the phonemes of the native words of English follows which cannot here be summarized: but the experiment is of interest. Of the practical value of the new phonology it is clearly far too early to speak, since everything is at the stage of speculation and experiment. The phoneme is no new discovery. Rather it symbolizes a striving after a more subtle and exact description of linguistic facts long known to

⁴ *Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University, Prague.* Sumptibus Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Carolinae: vol. v. pp. 188.

students, with a distinct leaning to abstract and psychological analysis. Historical or 'diachronic' aspects of language are ignored by the Prague phonologists; and English and American students of the phoneme have tended of late to emphasize rather all that is purely physical in describing similar sets of linguistic facts.

'What is a phoneme?' has been the most widely written-of problem of the year; and W. F. Twaddell's pamphlet *On Defining the Phoneme* goes a long way in showing up the unsatisfactory nature of all previous attempts at accurate definition—even if his own proposal may seem too complex and almost self-contradictory for permanent keeping.⁵ Twaddell effectively rejects conceptions of the phoneme which tend to be purely mental, like most of the Prague definitions, and is equally well able to show the inadequacy of purely physical explanations like those of Daniel Jones. He recognizes that the notion implied in the phoneme is not new, but that its emergence as a technical term is the result of the increased striving for accuracy and the more subtle means of observation of linguistic phenomena characteristic of our age. He himself would evade the difficulties of purely mental or purely physical definition by regarding the whole matter as a useful fiction—that is by defining the phoneme 'as an abstractive fictitious unit', a definition which may enable the scholar to use this valuable concept without too clearly committing himself to an exact meaning for the term.

'It is', he says, 'what might be called the thesis of this paper that it is inexpedient and probably impossible (at present) to associate the term with a reality: probably impossible, because the attempts by competent and conscientious linguists to define the phoneme in terms of reality have not been satisfactory; inexpedient, because the purposes to which the term may be put in our discipline are served equally well or better by regarding the phoneme as an abstractive, fictitious unit.'

Though this conclusion may seem disappointing, Twaddell's

⁵ *On Defining the Phoneme*, by W. Freeman Twaddell. (Language Monographs published by the Linguistic Society of America, XVI.) Baltimore: Waverly Press. pp. 62. \$1.25.

exposition of the defects of his phonematic predecessors is clear and convincing and definitely clarifies a difficult matter.

Morris Swadesh, in a forceful and clear article in *Language*, xi. 3 (Sept.), demonstrates the weakness of Twaddell's over-complex definition of the phoneme, under the title of *Twaddell on Defining the Phoneme*.

W. L. Graff, in his *Remarks on the Phoneme* (*American Speech*, April), emphasizes the danger of the psychological point of view; and, following a line of thought suggested probably by De Saussure's famous distinction between *Langue* and *Parole* and that recently formulated by A. H. Gardiner between *Speech* and *Language*, tells us very neatly that 'it may be said, then, that the phoneme is in the same relation to the phone as the mnemonic word is to the speech-word (i.e. the word actually placed in a speech context)'.

But the most important article on this theme comes from the School of Prague itself: for Josef Vachek's *Several thoughts on several Statements of the Phoneme theory* (*American Speech*, Dec.), is a brilliant and clear exposition.

Following Graff's line of thought noticed in the last paragraph, he shows how purely psychological explanations of the phoneme miss the point, thus freeing himself from what is supposed to be the weakness of Prague. He then attacks the merely physical explanations of Jones and the American Bloomfield and stresses the fundamentally *functional* meaning of the term as a basic conception of the Prague linguists (Trnka, Matthesius, and the rest). His own definition of the *phoneme* is as follows: 'The phoneme is a signal-like counter of the language which becomes manifested in actual speech by means of (two or more) sounds which are (1) related in character and (2) mutually exclusive as to their phonic surroundings.' He shows how the *phoneme* is a fact of *la Langue* (following De Saussure), and the *phone* (or sound) of *la Parole*. A valuable bibliography of the whole subject concludes this admirable piece of work.

N. Trubetzkoy, a pioneer of world-wide repute among modern philologists, has written a pamphlet intended to guide those seeking to describe a language in the new way. He calls it

*Anleitung zu phonologischen Beschreibungen.*⁶ After somewhat cavalierly dismissing the older philology as hopelessly one-sided, he provides brief definitions of the new terms and some suggestions for the practical application of the new *Phonologie*.

R. S. Heffner, in a paper in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, xvii (1935), discusses in his *Note on Phonologic Oppositions* the application of the new phoneme theory to 'dead' languages and especially Germanic. He finds that the time is not yet ripe for doing this with profit, although there may be hope for the future.

J. R. Firth in his paper *The Use and Distribution of certain English Sounds—Phonetics from a Functional point of view* (*English Studies*, xvii, Feb.) continues the discussion begun in his *Speech* (1930) and *Linguistics and the Functional Point of View* (*English Studies*, xvi).

Vilem Mathesius applies the new 'science' to foreign elements in a language in his *Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts* (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx); and among many examples from Czech are a few interesting English words examined.

J. R. Firth calls for a general overhauling of our linguistic theories and apparatus, especially in the field of semantics, in a somewhat amorphous but very stimulating paper entitled *The Technique of Semantics* contributed to *Transactions of the Philological Society*. He examines the history of the term *Semantic*, touches on the origin of the phoneme-theory, and makes an outline of a new technique for the study of words synchronically and with emphasis on their 'sociological context'. He shows what a fascinating study the new technique might lead to, though the article is merely tentative. He ends with a plea for a dictionary of linguistic terminology in English and for a dictionary of current idiom and usage.

A more philosophic and fundamental attempt is made to express the consequences of recent linguistic theory by Karl Bühler in his *Sprachtheorie*.⁷ Following in the steps of Paul,

⁶ *Anleitung zu phonologischen Beschreibungen*. Édition du Cercle Linguistic de Prague. pp. 32.

⁷ *Sprachtheorie, die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*, by Karl Bühler. Jena : Gustav Fischer, 1934. pp. xvi + 434.

De Saussure, and A. H. Gardiner (he especially admires the last named though not always agreeing with him), he makes a thorough examination of linguistic theory in the light of both the old and the new scholarship—a very useful survey of fundamental postulates.

Karl Haag's little pamphlet *Das Denkgerüst der Sprache*⁸ is mainly semasiological in character and will be found useful to students of semantics.

It is refreshing, after all this scientific jargon of *phoneme* and *phonology*—and there are those who would add to our terminology *morphemes* and *taxemes*, and even *mophonemes* and *tonemes*—to turn to Sir Richard Paget riding his amusing hobby-horse: for in his *This English* he returns to his now well-known theory of the origin of language in gesture⁹ with a demonstration of its consequences for English. Instead of regarding our language as a living, growing, and changing thing, we should, he holds, control and guide its future by our knowledge of its fundamentally symbolic nature. Thus, for instance, 'We know that the *a* in *calm* ought to be "broad"—because the symbolism of *calm* is expressed by the tongue being held low and flat in the mouth—like the surface of unruffled water.'

Another amusing, if not very important, investigation of this year has been carried out on 'language taboos' by J. M. Steadman, Jnr., and the results embodied in two articles—*A Study of Verbal Taboos* (*American Speech*, April), and *Language Taboos of American College Students* (*English Studies*, June). By 'taboos' Steadman means words which are consciously avoided in speech or writing, for whatever reason. The types of such words are classified, and some interesting light is thrown on the American vocabulary—as, for example, the avoidance of such an archaism as *poke* = bag.

The growing recognition of the importance of intonation in linguistic matters has led W. Franz, the specialist in Shake-

⁸ *Das Denkgerüst der Sprache*, by K. Haag. Heidelberg: Winter. pp. 44. RM. 0.75.

⁹ *This English*, by Sir Richard Paget, with a Preface by R. R. Marett. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner. pp. xii+118. 4s. 6d.

speare's pronunciation, to investigate carefully the rhythm of Mark Antony's famous speech to the Roman citizens in *Julius Caesar*: and this paper, entitled *Klangwirkung und Wortstellung* (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx) is of the sort that the late Karl Luick, that great master-historian of our grammar, to whom this volume of *Eng. Stud.* is a memorial, would have certainly appreciated.

Two impressions are left by the year's work indicated above. First, that the phoneme has been shown definitively to be fundamentally functional; and secondly, that the young science of *Linguistics* is trying more and more to claim separate existence and to develop its own technique in growing isolation from those historical and traditional factors which belong to *Philology* in the common English acceptance of the term.

Once again a large amount of work has appeared this year on vocabulary from almost every point of view, but especially historical and etymological. But though reports continue to reach us of plans and preliminaries of the several important dictionaries already projected, W. A. Craigie's *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* is the only strictly lexicographical work¹⁰ of outstanding significance which has made published progress. Of this pioneer work the general characteristics were noticed in *The Year's Work*, xii. 38: but Craigie has himself set out the well-known general facts concerning the language dealt with in his Dictionary in a paper contributed to the *Transactions of the Philological Society* entitled *Older Scottish and English: a Study in Contrasts*.

J. F. Bense, whose *Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary* was first noticed in *The Year's Work*, vii. 41-2, has issued his fourth part,¹¹ carrying this learned and discursive work as far as *Smeary* and leaving only one more part to complete the whole. Bense has added a 'Third Additional List of Books referred to', and continues with extraordinary

¹⁰ *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the Twelfth century to the end of the Seventeenth: part v. Chamberlane-Commove.* pp. 481-600, by Sir William A. Craigie. O.U.P. 21s.

¹¹ *A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary,* by J. F. Bense. Part IV, *Plashment-Smeary.* pp. vii+289-416. 16s.

thoroughness his efforts to make the debt to Dutch and the other Low German dialects seem as large as possible. In treating of *polder* = 'a piece of low-lying land reclaimed from the sea', he very emphatically states the Dutch origin of the word without so much as mentioning the evidence of place-names, which, as A. Mawer has shown (*Problems of Place-name Study*, pp. 51-2), may well be argued in favour of a native English word cognate with, but not directly adapted from, the Dutch. The truth is that the origin of *polder*, as of so many other words discussed by Bense, remains in doubt: but this regular giving to the Dutch of the benefit of every possible doubt has tended to make the Dutch element in our vocabulary appear to be far larger than most philologists would be disposed to allow. The foreigner's almost unavoidable ignorance of certain aspects of our colloquial language has sometimes led Bense into wrong inferences—inferences which would be entirely legitimate if the evidence to be considered consisted of written English alone.

Several 'dictionaries' of a more popular type have appeared this year which contain matter of interest to scholars incidentally. These are dictionaries of American usage, of proverbs, and of the kind of English that the foreigner needs.

Horwill's *Dictionary of Modern American Usage*¹² covers those words (allowing for differences merely of form) which are in use both here and in the United States, deliberately excluding all that is entirely American, which latter, he says, must be left to the great *Historical Dictionary of American English* which Craigie is now preparing at Chicago. The book is primarily intended for Englishmen visiting America or using American books, Americans wishing to realize more fully the individuality of their own country's linguistic character (for whose benefit a good deal of space has been given to specially English usages), and for all such linguistic students as are interested in semantic change. Nothing historical has been attempted; but Horwill has collected the whole of his material from thirty years of observation as an Englishman. While slang is professedly excluded, it has,

¹² *A Dictionary of Modern American Usage*, by H. W. Horwill. O.U.P. pp. xii + 360. 7s. 6d.

naturally, been found difficult to separate this from what is colloquial: and the English reader will be interested to find specially marked those usages from America which (*a*) seem on the way to becoming naturalized in this country, and (*b*) those which have already become part of our language. The book's title was, as Horwill says, suggested by Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*; but its purpose is, of course, far from that of teaching Americans their own language. The English student will regret, however, the necessary omission of many interesting American words not found in English, such as *hood-lum*. The book is attractively written, though from a rather popular point of view, and should greatly stimulate interest in its subject.

The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs,¹³ which contains over ten thousand items, was the life-work of W. G. Smith, which his health did not, unfortunately, permit him to revise himself for the press. The 'proverbs' are listed in alphabetical order by their first letter, though the index gives the main words of each: and this somewhat awkward plan is further complicated by the fact that the compiler does not seem to have set himself any clear definition of a proverb as a guide. Thus, for example, among the vast number of items which all begin with the word *the*, we find Wordsworth's famous 'The child is father of the man'. Now in what sense is this saying of the poet a proverb? The quotations which illustrate it are only two: one from Samuel Smiles in which Wordsworth is named as the author of the phrase, and the other from F. W. H. Myers's book on Wordsworth where the meaning is explained. Mrs. Heseltine's introductory essay gives an historical account of the development of the proverb, starting from Bede, with descriptions of the principal collections that have been made. She ends by drawing attention to the very interesting recently discovered Durham Cathedral Library MS. (B. III. 32), which is an eleventh-century hymnal containing—besides the hymns and Ælfric's *Grammar*—46 proverbs in Latin and OE. Some

¹³ *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs*, compiled by William George Smith, with Introduction and Index by Janet E. Heseltine. O.U.P. pp. xxviii + 644. 21s.

of these latter are of considerable importance ; such, for instance, as that cited on p. xxviii, which seems to throw a clear light on the interpretation of line 68 of the OE. poem *The Wanderer*. She holds out some hope that Max Förster may publish these proverbs from Durham. The work suffers here and there from the apparent ignorance of the compiler of the earlier stages of our language, which leads to misunderstandings like that of line 236 of *The Owl and the Nightingale* on p. 153. No account seems to have been taken of the recent excellent collection of ME. proverbs published by the John Rylands Library. Every proverb is illustrated historically by quotations, though completeness has not been aimed at in this regard. The book does, however, aim at completeness in recording every proverb in English from the earliest times to this day.

M. West, in his *Definition Vocabulary*,¹⁴ discusses the results of experiments conducted by the author with a view to discovering what would be the smallest and most useful vocabulary for the purpose of writing dictionary definitions in English for foreigners. He concludes on a vocabulary of only 1,923 words, and proposes to construct a dictionary of 24,000 items in which the vocabulary of the definitions shall be limited to this list, which a foreigner able to use an English-English dictionary must be assumed to know. In the course of the discussion on dictionary definitions, some very interesting and useful considerations on lexicographical problems are put forward.

The dictionary for which the work noticed in the above paragraph was done is, in fact, based on a definition-vocabulary of only 1,490 words,¹⁵ and should answer its purpose well. A plan of indicating pronunciation by means of numbers placed within brackets after the words is a novel feature of the book which may be thought very convenient. Each number corresponds to a phonetic value. Words whose definition can be clarified visually are sometimes illustrated by little diagrams (*fulcrum*, for instance), or by pictures such as that of the lotus-flower.

¹⁴ *Definition Vocabulary*, by Michael West. Univ. of Toronto. pp. 105. \$1.

¹⁵ *The New Method English Dictionary*, by Michael Philip West and James Gareth Endicott. Longmans, Green. pp. viii + 341.

Of the reports which reach us of the progress of dictionaries not yet published, the most interesting—not to say startling—is the preliminary report on *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries* which S. Moore, S. B. Meech, and H. Whitehall have prepared¹⁶ for the projected *Middle English Dictionary*. After drawing up a list of definitely localized documents, and of others which may, for various reasons, be relied on in the authors' judgement for the purpose in hand, ten phonological or inflexional characters are taken as indications of dialect, and the country marked out by 'isophonic' lines into ten areas, each of which presents a more or less distinct complex of dialect-characteristics. In the course of 60 pages considerable detailed reasons are given for the conclusions suggested, though again and again the merely tentative and provisional nature of everything suggested, and the inadequacy of the material employed, are emphasized. Three maps, showing the conclusions reached—and even suggesting some possible correlation between physiographical and dialectal characters—are in a pocket at the end of the volume. The documents selected include only Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyt* of the three great self-consistent ME. MSS. (*Ayenbite of Inwyt*, *Orrmulum*, and the Corpus Christi Cambridge MS. of *Ancrene Wisse*) which one would naturally have expected to be taken as the necessary basis of any study of the type contemplated here. MS. Bodley 34, which is to be reckoned as a basic text along with the *Ancrene Wisse* mentioned above, is noticed, but only to be rejected, apparently for reasons supplied to the writers of this report by Miss Hope Allen (p. 50); and Tolkien's well-known elucidation of the nature of its language in *Essays and Studies* by Members of the English Association for 1929 is not given even an 'honourable mention'. It should, perhaps, be observed in passing that Miss Allen's note (*M.L.R.*, Oct. 1933) pointing out that the *marginalia* connecting MS. Bodley 34 (and therefore

¹⁶ *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries: preliminary report of an investigation . . .*, by Samuel Moore, Sanford Brown Meech, and Harold Whitehall (in *Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, by Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan, xiii). Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press. pp. viii + 328. \$3.

the Corpus Christi *Ancrene Wisse*) with Herefordshire are in sixteenth-, and not fourteenth-century hands, does not really affect the argument as to the fundamental value of these MSS. as representing clearly defined types of pure ME.

Despite the admirable work of R. W. Chambers and M. Daunt, to which a debt is acknowledged, the expression 'London English' is used too freely; and there are inaccuracies which may seriously detract from the value of this pioneer work. Thus, the participle in *-nd* is taken as a dialect-character, though every one hitherto has taken the originally Scandinavian type in *-and* as something quite distinct. The *Poema Morale* is localized at Christchurch (Hants), merely on the evidence of MS. Egerton 613, ignoring the clearly more important character of the Trinity as well as of the Digby versions (p. 56). On p. 51 MS. Arundel 57 of the work of Dan Michel is oddly named Royal 19 C. II.

It is sad to have to add that the death of Samuel Moore in September 1934 not only deprived this report of the advantages of his revision of the final proofs, but also the whole scheme of a distinguished and most respected promoter and editor.

It will be appropriate here to note the fundamental reflections on the making of dictionaries in general put forward by V. Slovsky in *Neophilologus* (xx. 2) entitled *Considérations théoriques sur la conception d'un Dictionnaire*.

The now common pastime of adding to or correcting the great Oxford Dictionary is well represented by W. Jaggard in *N. and Q.* (Nov. 23) in *Words and Meanings: Additions to the 'N.E.D.'*. He cites *Dilucidation* from the year 1612 as against the *O.E.D.*'s entry of three years later, and adds the hitherto unrecorded meaning 'legal costs' (used humorously) for *Giblets* from a work dated 1858. But his principal discovery is the word *Aquadigipsycharmonica*—a musical instrument of about two octaves, constructed of wide-mouthed tumblers in graded sequence, producing a clear bell-like note when played with a wet finger-tip. Both Goldsmith and Gray appear to have referred to it.

In the sphere of etymological studies, Mary Serjeantson's

*History of Foreign Words in English*¹⁷ must be accorded the first place. By ‘foreign words’ Miss Serjeantson means all those which have entered our language otherwise than by descent from Germanic itself, and she lays the main emphasis on their first appearance in England, naturally taking the bulk of her information from the *O.E.D.* The words are classified according to the languages from which they have come into English; and there is also a brief general introduction, and appendices giving a list of pre-Conquest words from Latin, notes on the phonology of Latin words in OE., Scandinavian vowels in OE. and ME., and notes on the phonology of French words in ME. A bibliography and subject and word-indexes conclude the book. While the work will be of value to students of the history of the language, it is intended to appeal to some extent, apparently, to the educated general reader; and it is probably for this latter reason that space is given freely to the translation of OE. words and phrases as well as to that of foreign material. As the book has to cover the whole of a vast field, its necessary incompleteness needs no apology: for the material for a treatment of the whole subject is not yet available, as Miss Serjeantson remarks. But most students will regret the omission of most of that historical background which is an essential part of the study of any kind of language, and often one has the impression of mere lists of words. Similarly, it may be regretted by some that more space could not have been given to semantic matters. The phonological part of the work—mostly in the appendices—is technically not quite satisfying, probably because of the need for condensation. This is especially noticeable in the appendix on the Scandinavian vowels, where (as in the handling of OE. *lagu* and ON. *lög* on p. 293) there seems to be confusion between Primitive Norse, from which the Scandinavian element in OE. and ME. must be generally derived, and the ‘Old Norse’ of dictionaries and of literature, which corresponded in time rather with ME. than with OE. and does not show forms early enough to have influenced English at all considerably. Miss Serjeantson has carried through a very difficult task with thoroughness and

¹⁷ *A History of Foreign Words in English*, by Mary Serjeantson. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner. pp. iv + 354. 21s.

effectiveness within the limits of her plan, and her book goes far towards satisfying a very real need.

A. C. Baugh, in *M.L.N.* (Feb.), reviews Jespersen's tables showing the numbers of French words which entered our language in successive periods, and is able to modify Jespersen's conclusions and present in this *Chronology of French loan-words in English* a slightly more exact and complete picture of the facts discussed.

G. N. Clark, too, though he disclaims any knowledge of philology, has written a popular and interesting little pamphlet¹⁸ on *The Dutch Influence on the English Vocabulary*. Without attempting to treat the problem technically or fully, he makes it into a pleasant historical essay.

The kindred problems presented by so-called folk-etymology and word-contamination have produced two books by young foreign scholars, of which Maria Houtzager's *Unconscious Sound- and Sense-assimilations*¹⁹ is the more important; for it is vivid and shows wide learning and interests. Maria Houtzager treats philosophically of the problem of 'popular or folk-etymology'; that is, the influences of words upon one another, whether in form or meaning through unconscious processes. But since no 'folk'—and linguistic changes are far more rapid among the uneducated—consciously forms notions about words and their uses, she easily proves that the expression is misleading. She takes the four languages, English, German, Dutch, and Swedish for her material; and, while giving selective lists of words which have developed in form through sound- and sense-assimilation, pays special attention to place-names, since these latter are especially liable to the processes here investigated. She is led to the conclusion that 'The sense-elements play the principal part in those changes in words designated by the term *popular etymology*, and that the sound-elements play a minor part, although still a part which cannot be neglected'. The main causes of the observed phenomena are therefore psychological,

¹⁸ *The Dutch Influence on the English Vocabulary*, by G. N. Clark. S.P.E. Tract xliv. O.U.P. pp. 161–72. 1s. 6d.

¹⁹ *Unconscious Sound- and Sense-assimilations*, by Maria Elisabeth Houtzager. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris. pp. vii + 194. Ing. f. 3.

though physiological factors must be taken into account. The English word-lists and the discussion of some English place-names will be found to be of general interest and sometimes suggest fresh lines of thought. Words like *ambergrease* for *ambergris* are well known to students; but the quaint story of the 'Eleven thousand virgins' will be less familiar. Occasional technical errors like the explanation of *standard* (cf. the *O.E.D.*) on p. 61 do not seriously detract from the value of the work as a whole.

Ursula Behr's doctoral thesis *Wortkontamination in der neuenglischen Schriftsprache*²⁰ starts with Hermann Paul's definition of *Kontamination* from *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, and after modifying this a little, is mainly occupied with the compilation of a list of all the Modern English words which can be thought to show inter-influence. *Kontamination* is elaborately classified and the words listed under the appropriate divisions. Little is offered by way of discussion of fundamental matters or of the historical background, and there is a good deal that seems immature or hasty. Nevertheless, the compilation will be found useful to some extent, since it contains a few examples not elsewhere noticed.

Before turning to more specialized etymological studies, a passing mention must be made of Ernest Weekley's linguistic miscellany, *Something about Words*.^{20a} It is of the type which the word-loving public has learned to expect from the author of *The Romance of Words*, and, as usual, is of wide and varied interest. Here are papers and lectures (mostly reprinted) on the future of English, proverbs, Scott's influence on English, older etymologists, and place-names, besides others calculated to amuse and instruct the general reader. The chapter called 'Our Earlier Etymologists', which deals with Minsheu, Skinner, Junius, Lye, &c., contains pleasing sketches of some of the earliest English lexicographers and will afford the reader some

²⁰ *Wortkontamination in der neuenglischen Schriftsprache*, by U. Behr. Würzburg: Mayr. pp. 156.

^{20a} *Something about Words*, by Ernest Weekley. John Murray. pp. viii + 233. 5s.

information not easily come by so entertainingly; but it is too sketchy and superficial to be a safe guide to the serious seeker after knowledge. Similar remarks might be made on most of the other chapters. But every one will hope that Weekley will not be able to carry out his threat to make this his last work of the kind.

The year has produced a number of notes and small articles on single lexicographical problems which may conveniently be placed together here. Most of them, especially those dealing with OE., are purely speculative in character; but those by Weekley (on *Codlin*) and Malone (on *Harlequin*) provide definite additions to our knowledge, and the semantic articles of Deutschbein (on *Road*) and of Whitehall (on *Bask*) are of some interest and importance.

Willy Krogmann, in *Anglia* (Apr.), offers as his contribution to this *Festschrift* for the late Karl Luick a note on OE. *To-socnung*—a word rendering *Adquisitio* in the *Durham Ritual* but not hitherto clearly treated by the dictionaries. Krogmann shows that we must admit the existence of a distinct word *socnung* parallel to OHG. *souhnung(a)* and similar forms in other dialects.

Herbert Meritt (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) seeks a new point of view in the explanation of the seemingly corrupt and incomprehensible OE. gloss *Ober eliman. innannorum*, which occurs in three manuscripts in sections dealing with the meaning of words in the Book of Job. By an elaborate and ingenious process he arrives, tentatively as he says, at the reconstruction *Lim on obere* = 'sticky earth on the shore', and is able to explain *innannorum* as a Latin addition, i.e., *Maniorum*, since *Cocytus*, with which the passage is concerned, was a river of the infernal regions, and *Maniorum* is a well attested form of the gen. pl. of *Manes*.

Hermann Harder (*Archiv*, Dec.) has, under the heading *Einags. Sternbildname*, explained the OE. gloss of *Hyadas* as *Raedgasram* (in the *Corpus Gloss*, for instance) by the Germanic name Radger (in Procopius) and the OE. *hræfn*. The explanation seems plausible enough, but would need confirmation of some kind.

L. R. M. Strachan in *N. and Q.* (April 6) has compiled a useful statement from reference-books on the occurrences of *-flæd* in OE. proper names entitled *Flæd in Anglo-Saxon Names*. Its use in women's names like *Eðelflæd* is evidently quite common, though the exact original meaning of the element is still not quite clear.

George Watson, in his article (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.) headed *The Designation of an Atmospheric Phenomenon*, deals with a list of dialect-words—mainly Scottish—for ‘The undulating or flickering motion of the air immediately above the earth, as seen under certain conditions on a hot day’ (*heat haze* is the nearest equivalent in the literary language). Some of his material is but little known.

Hope Emily Allen, in her *Influence of Superstition on Vocabulary; two related Examples*, has collected (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) from the files of the projected *Early Modern English Dictionary* which she is helping to edit, a number of illustrations of the effects on the meaning of *Fly* and *Bug* wrought by their superstitious associations. Although nothing not already known emerges, it is convenient to have this material assembled in one article, and there is something to interest the folklorist.

In *M.L.R.* (Apr.) E. Weekley has a decisive note headed *Etymology of 'Codlin'*, which seems to settle the matter—both for the surname and the apple—finally. Recalling his own earlier tentative suggestion and Bardsley's definite opinion that the Norfolk surname *quodling* or *Codlin(g)* was identical with that of the Norfolk apple, Weekley has now found evidence that as early as the *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie* a certain legendary apple had been named *Pomes de Richart* after Richard Sans-peur of Normandy. The giving of such names was therefore an old custom; and he argues that the fifteenth-century name *Querdling* for the Norfolk apple (*Promptorium Parvulorum*)= the fourteenth-century *Querdelyon* named after Richard Cœur-de-Lion. An Englishman, as Weekley says, might well prefer to call the apple of the *Chronique* named after Richard Sans-peur by the name of his own popular hero-king *Cœur-de-Lion*.

The early history of our word *Harlequin*, with much light on its semantic development, is fully set out by Kemp Malone in

English Studies (Aug.) under the title of *Herlekin and Herlewin*. He equates Ordericus Vitalis's legendary *Familia Herlechini* (a name for the Wild Host) with an ultimate OE. *Herla Cyning* as far as the proper name is concerned, and accepts Walter Map's *Familia* or *Phalanges Herlethingi* as merely a variant due to the manuscript confusion of *c* and *t*. Peter of Blois's *Herlewini* (gen.) later in the twelfth-century *Malone* plausibly equates with a hypothetical OE. *Herlan wine*, i.e. the *wine* or followers of King *Herla*. He conjectures that this King *Herla* was originally *Woden*, and compares the *Herelingas of Widsip*. With the later history of *Harlequin* (the *qu* is merely the French for the English *k*) he is not here concerned. His etymology is attractive and well argued.

Following the thought of an article in *T.L.S.* for 2 August 1934, on the development of the meaning of the word *Road*, Max Deutschbein in his *Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von Road bei Shakespeare*, in *Anglia* (July), a volume dedicated to Johannes Hoops on his seventieth birthday, discusses whether the fact that Shakespeare is the first writer known to have used the word in the sense of 'highway' is accidental, or rather to be attributed to the dramatist's linguistically creative fancy. He traces the development of *Road* = 'a place where ships anchor', to the OE. *on ancre ridan*, and shows that the passage of the word from the nautical to the common land sense can only be seen in Shakespeare's work, from which he quotes all the relevant examples. He notes how slowly—even after Shakespeare had, as it were, led the way—the now ordinary use of the term gained currency during the seventeenth century, and concludes in favour of *die Shakespearische sprachschöpferische Phantasie* as the prime cause of the semantic change. He ends by comparing the somewhat parallel history of *Roadster*.

Harold Whitehall throws grave doubts on the universally accepted etymology of the verb *Bask* in his *The Background of the verb Bask* (*P.Q.*, July). He begins by calling attention to the fact that the word is first recorded, in the sense of 'to bathe' (the only sense before Shakespeare), from Gower according to the *O.E.D.*, and then only in a passage of Lydgate which clearly is merely an imitation of Gower. How comes it, he asks, that a word supposed to originate from ON. *baðask* is first recorded

in an area not markedly Scandinavian? Again, as he says, the modern post-Shakespearian meanings of the verb seem to have little connexion with the idea of bathing implied in adaptation from *baðask*. Whitehall concludes that *bask* must have had some origin other than that hitherto taken for granted, though he is not very clear in putting forward his alternative. His views should be carefully considered.

Though much has been written this year on the various aspects of historical grammar of all periods, only one full-length treatment of the whole subject has appeared. Syntax has produced less significant work than usual, and dialect-studies seem to have languished, apart from their very vigorous forward movements in America.

The book of the year, then, is A. C. Baugh's *History of the English Language*, though its intention is rather for the benefit of the university student than the breaking of new ground.²¹ The principal facts concerning Indo-European origins, &c., are neatly summarized in an initial chapter, and there is another on 'The 19th century and after' (chiefly from an American point of view) at the end. Special attention has been paid to foreign influences, and there is even a chapter on the foreign elements in OE. Each chapter concludes with a very useful students' bibliographical list, and there is a fairly good index. The most successful parts of the book deal with vocabulary, especially its foreign elements; and as a result, probably of attempting to compress so much into a single volume, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries receive relatively meagre treatment. There is a good deal of 'slick' summarizing in the book; but all will be grateful for the specimens of each period of the language which it contains, and for the appendix on ME. dialects with representative texts excerpted by way of illustration (but the choice of *The Owl and the Nightingale* to represent the South is not happy). The phonetic symbols employed are to some extent of a popular kind, as appears clearly in the transcription of Lincoln's famous Gettysburg speech on p. 401. There is a rough map on p. 447 showing

²¹ *A History of the English Language*, by Albert C. Baugh. New York: D. Appleton Century Co. pp. xiii + 509. \$3,00.

the dialect-distribution in the United States. Such an attempt to do everything for the student of our language in a single volume cannot but suffer from compression and lack of vitality: but Baugh has made the book as good as a work of this kind could be, besides adding to our knowledge here and there in his own special field of vocabulary.

The new 'British' edition of Bloomfield's *Language*²² is a reprint of the American revised edition of 1933, with a few minor changes, chiefly for the benefit of the British reader, but including the adoption throughout of the phonetic symbols of the International Association. The book, of course, properly belongs to general linguistic theory; but since its illustrations are mainly from English, and it is intended for the general public rather than for the advanced student, it was found more convenient to call attention to it here.

J. Bongartz's little book on the significance of German dialect-research for the teaching of English is mainly intended for German students.²³ Its object is to emphasize the kinship of English and German and their common culture, to show how modern methods of dialect-study may be made fruitful in the study of English by those who will make themselves familiar with their results for German, and to create a more vivid interest in Germanic studies generally.

K.-G. Dorow's doctoral dissertation on the eighteenth-century Scottish schoolmaster and student of language, James Elphinstone,²⁴ though limited in scope, is valuable to the student of modern Scottish: for Elphinstone's *Anallysis ov dhe Scottish Dialect*, which forms the second volume of his *Propriety ascertained in her picture* (1787), is a very rare work, and Dorow has made a careful description of Scottish in a scientific manner—with

²² *Language*, by Leonard Bloomfield. London: Allen and Unwin. pp. ix + 566. 15s.

²³ *Die deutsche Mundartforschung in ihrer Bedeutung für den englischen Unterricht*, by Josef Bongartz. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt. pp. 130. RM. 5.

²⁴ *Die Beobachtungen des Sprachmeisters James Elphinston über die schottische Mundart*, by Kurt-Günter Dorow. Weimar: Wagner Sohn. pp. viii + 77.

sections on phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary—treating everything from an historical standpoint. The book should also stimulate interest in Elphinston, who has hitherto generally only been recognized for his better known work on the grammar and orthography of English.

Two veteran *Anglisten*, Luick and Max Förster—the former, alas, since dead—have made the outstanding contributions of the year to phonology on problems which are primarily OE. Karl Luick's article, *Zur Palatalisierung (Anglia, July)*, discusses the whole question of the palatalizing of the Gmc. gutturals represented in OE. by *c* and *g*. He stresses the inadequacy of explanations which assume that the palatalized OE. *c* and *g* which were assilated finally were later re-gutturalized, so to speak, under Norse influence in strongly Scandinavian areas: for examples occur where no Norse influence could have occurred. He prefers to assume early double types of words—with the *k* or *g* either palatalized or not according to the quality of the neighbouring vowel: thus, for instance, a Gmc. sing. **dīk* beside a pl. **dīkos* (the one having palatalized *k* and the other retaining the guttural) might have been the ultimate source of our *ditch* beside *dike*. The tendency of OE. was to eliminate the forms with gutturals in favour of the later palatalized varieties; Gmc. **brugjo* and W. Gmc. **bruggjo* giving OE. *brycg*, and palatal forms being preferred wherever there were doublets. But the Norse influence, Luick admits, might still have accounted in primary Norse areas of influence for a restoration of the guttural forms which were at the time fast disappearing. No summary here can do justice to Luick's lucid and convincing analysis, which is important for ME. as well as for OE. His work was of the highest quality to the end.

Max Förster's article entitled *Zur i-Epenthese im Altenglischen* is in *Anglia* (July) also and is an important contribution to the problem it treats of. He returns to the question of the exact nature of the *-oi-* in Bede's proper names which he had opened some years ago (*Eng. Stud.*, lvi) with his equation of Leeds to Bede's *Loidis*. Now, besides demonstrating the truly diphthongal nature of the *-oi-* in OE. names like those in *Coin-*, he argues forcibly that the *-ui-* of early OE. orthography must

also have been a genuine diphthong. The kind of evidence upon which he relies consists of Celtic loan-words from OE. like the Welsh *ystwyrian* which he would derive from OE. *styrian*, and examples of OE. words taken over from Celtic like *dry* from Irish *drūi*. Perhaps he strains our consciences a little in asking us to believe that *Campaina* in Alfred's *Orosius* for the Latin *Campania* is connected with *i*-Umlaut; but the general impression will probably be that Förster has gone a long way towards establishing that both *-oi-* and *-ui-* of early OE. spelling were truly diphthongal.

Huntington Brown, in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, xvii (1935), has a useful article entitled *The Modern Development of Middle-English -ly, -lie in Rhyme*. He points out that, whereas *-ly* *-lie* of French origin often rhymes with developments of ME. *-ī* in early Modern English, it scarcely ever does with the modern result of ME. tense *ē* before the nineteenth century. He gives the proper historical reasons for this, and draws some fairly obvious inferences.

Of a number of small papers on matters of early Modern English pronunciation, the most interesting is that of H. C. Wyld entitled *The Significance of -n and -en in Milton's Spelling* contributed to the volume of *Eng. Stud.* (lxx) in honour of Luick. He examines and enlarges upon Miss Darbishire's discussion of Milton's spelling in her introduction to *The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost, Book I*. He inclines to think that certain lines of Milton prove *-en* as a separate syllable, while at other times such an ending was not quite syllabic. Thus, for instance, the word *golden* in the line

‘With gemms & golden lustre rich emblaz'd’

must certainly have been intended as two syllables by Milton, who may perhaps have pronounced it something like [gōldin]. At least something more syllabic than a vocalic *n* is, Wyld holds, to be assumed for Milton's intended pronunciation in such lines. As Milton was keenly interested in sounds and symbols, the matter is of importance.

Don Cameron Allen in *A Note on 16th-century Vernacular English (Language, xi)*, calls attention to the spellings of Junius's

Nomenclator (1567): but Sir W. A. Craigie, in his *The English of the 'Nomenclator'* in the same periodical (Sept.) shows that the *Nomenclator* is full of misprints and errors and that its spellings cannot, therefore, be relied on very definitely.

William Matthews's *Sailors' Pronunciation in the second half of the Seventeenth Century*, in *Anglia* (Apr.), gives abundant lists from log-books in the Record Office and the British Museum not yet published, which generally confirm current knowledge of the spellings of the period, since the officers (or their clerks) who kept the logs usually tried to write some sort of 'literary' English.

Of more significance is Helge Kökeritz's *English Pronunciation as described in Shorthand systems of the 17th and 18th Centuries* (*Studia Neophilologica*, vii). Here is a full-length picture, with copious examples and a discussion and scientific analysis.

Arvid Gabrielson has found some interesting notes on seventeenth-century pronunciation, too, from a contemporary book which he has excerpted in his *Elisha Coles's 'Syncrisis'* (1675) as a source of Information on 17th-century English (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx).

The work on syntax has not been of great significance: it is mostly on historical matters, and may be indicated very briefly. The only complete work on syntax worthy of mention is W. Schlachter's treatise on the position of the adverb in the Germanic languages.²⁵ This deals with the adverb in word-order, limiting the examination to prose texts and classifying the adverbs according to their syntactic types. Most of the material is from ON. and OHG. texts, but OE. is also illustrated, though not fully enough. Gothic is neglected.

Rudolf Hittmair's *Zu den Aktionsarten im Mittelenglischen* (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx) examines W. Häusermann's *Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittelenglischen* (Vienna, 1930), and in the course of the discussion seeks to make clear the distinction between *Aktionsart* and *Aspekt*.

A. Dekker examines in some detail and with additional information of his own B. Trnka's work *On the Syntax of the*

²⁵ *Zur Stellung des Adverbs im Germanischen*, by Wolfgang Schlachter. Leipzig: Mayer u. Müller. pp. xiv + 248. (Palaestra, 200.)

English Verb from Caxton to Dryden (Prague, 1930) in *Neophilologus* (xx).

The syntax, as well as the form, of the Indefinite Article in early times, is treated in Peter Süsskand's historical survey²⁶ which covers both OE. and early ME. His bibliography of editions of texts is antiquated and there seems to be a good deal that is inaccurate, but some useful information emerges. Only texts to 1250 are included, and Süsskand prefers to work with periods rather than dialects as a means of classification. He introduces the rather strange term *Neuangelisch-sächsisch* (p. 57) for the language of the *Trinity Homilies* and justifies, he believes, this practice. He uses the spelling *Lagamon* for the author of the *Brut* consistently.

A number of articles on miscellaneous matters must be now noticed. They do not admit of very clear classification, and are therefore listed as far as possible chronologically. None of them seems to require more than the briefest mention, though each has its interest.

A. J. Barnouw's *How English was taught in Jan van Hout's Leyden*, in *English Studies* (Feb.), gives an account of Jacob Walraven's translation of Whetstone's *Honourable Reputation of a Souldier* into Dutch, made in 1586, printed in parallel Dutch and English columns. This rare book contains a most instructive appendix consisting of an English manual, again printed in Dutch and English parallel texts.

Otto Jespersen's *A Few Back-formations* (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx) lists and annotates words of the type *retice* (from *reticent*), *intuite* and *introspect* as verbs, compounds like *book-hunt*, and common formations from Latin past participles like *create*. Occasionally his matter supplements the *O.E.D.* and its *Supplement*.

Edwin Berck Dike's *Obsolete English Words: some Recent Views*, in *J.E.G.P.* (July), gives a useful bibliography of the subject and tentatively offers suggestions as to the causes which bring about the disappearance of words.

A. H. Swaen's paper on *Malapropism* in *Eng. Stud.* (lxx)

²⁶ *Geschichte des unbestimmten Artikels im Alt- und Frühmittelenglischen*, by P. Süsskand. Halle: Max Niemeyer. pp. x+187.

treats the subject historically and shows Shakespeare's Dogberry and some of Congreve's characters among its early practitioners.

Max Deutschbein's *Der rhythmische Charakter der neu-englischen Bibelübersetzung von 1611*, in *Eng. Stud.* (lxx), discusses the poetical effects of the rhythmical arrangement of words by comparing the *Authorized Version* of the Bible with Tyndale—to whom very much of its rhythm is to be traced—and with the poetry of Wordsworth.

Only one contribution to English historical dialect-study is to be noted this year. William Matthews's article, entitled *The Lincolnshire Dialect in the 18th Century* (*N. and Q.*, Dec. 7), describes and excerpts with annotations the hitherto unnoticed British Museum MS. Add. 32640—'Glossaries in the Lincolnshire Dialect, 1779–1783'. This consists of four lists of dialect-words compiled by Sarah Sophia Banks (sister of Sir Joseph Banks). It is the earliest Lincolnshire material yet found, and contains a few forms which have not otherwise been recorded. Matthews gives 'The Scolding Wife, a new song in the Lincolnshire dialect', in Miss Banks's rough attempt at phonetic transcription, together with a list of 300 words from Lincolnshire not found in other specifically Lincolnshire dialect-material—though many of them have been recorded from other parts of the country. Matthews's own notes are not accurate, but the material he has printed is of value.

Finally, there is the important volume from Michigan University entitled *Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature* (see p. 42). Besides the report on ME. dialect-characteristics already discussed, it contains articles almost exclusively devoted to the history of English. H. Whitehall contributes *Some Fifteenth-century Spellings from the Nottingham Records*, as well as an ingenious piece of etymologizing headed *Scaitcliffe, a Place-name Derivation*. S. B. Meech's *An Early Treatise in English concerning Latin Grammar* discusses a text found in MS. Trinity Coll. Cambridge (0.5.4.) containing some interesting West Midland (Shrewsbury) spellings, the earliest occurrences of a number of Latin grammatical terms

in their English form (often ante-dating the evidence of the *O.E.D.*), and a full English paradigm of the verb *to love*. It occasionally, too, shows a word (like *unlittleness*) not hitherto recorded at all. A. H. Marckwardt's *Origin and Extension of the Voiceless Preterit and the Past Participle Inflections of the English Irregular Weak Verb Conjugation* is the only attempt at a thorough examination of the subject that has yet appeared. He is concerned with weak verbs which add a voiceless stop *t* to forms ending in voiced consonants when making the past tenses; as, for example, *dream dreamed* (but actually pronounced [dre^mt], *feel felt*, *mean meant*, &c. A bibliography concludes this discourse.

Besides a number of articles on special problems, four full-length studies of the place-names of counties—three in England and one in Scotland—emphasize the growing importance of this subject; more and more, historians, philologists, and other specialists are giving attention to its findings. The twelfth volume of the Place-name Society's publications embodies the most impressive work of the year.

P. H. Reaney's volume on Essex²⁷ follows the usual plan of its predecessors. But each county has its own peculiar interest and problems, which should lend individuality to any book about it; and Reaney has generally made the most of his abundant material from this point of view. Besides the usual historical introduction, there are valuable notes on the evidence on the Essex dialect furnished by the forms of its place-names, and everywhere the implications of place-name evidence for the early social history of the county are attractively brought out. As with the more recent volumes of the series, field-names have been studied whenever available. Essex provides a number of additions to our knowledge of the OE. vocabulary through the early forms of its place-names, such as *æled* in *Althorne* (not otherwise recorded as a place-name element), *cylu* in *Kelvedon Hatch* (otherwise known only in glosses), and **dylfen* in *Delvyn's Farm* (*dylfen* = 'broad, deep trench or ditch' is probably formed from the same root as *delfan* 'to dig'). A list of the chief Essex

²⁷ *The Place-names of Essex*, by P. H. Reaney. English Place-name Society, vol. xii. C.U.P. pp. 1-698. 25s.

place-name elements is provided, the streets of Colchester are listed and their names examined, and the exceptionally strong Norman-French influence is well brought out. One could wish that more space had been given to the sketch of the early history of Essex; and, in particular, Bede's forms of the name of the first Christian king *Sæberht* might have been more clearly explained. The arrangement of the names under their hundreds is admirably supported by maps provided in a pocket at the end of the volume.

J. K. Wallenberg's laborious work on Kentish place-names²⁸ could not be noticed last year, though it was published in 1934. It follows the general plan of the Place-name Society's volumes, but has no historical introduction and omits all names of fields, farms, &c., for which only modern evidence exists. It also omits the discussion of a number of names recorded from pre-Conquest charters, since these were fully treated of in Wallenberg's separate study of the names of the Kentish charters before the Norman Conquest (*Kentish Place-names: a Topographical and Etymological Study of the Place-name material in Kentish Charters dated before the Conquest*. Uppsala, 1931). Indeed, for a complete picture of the evidence on Kentish place-names, the two books should be studied together, as they are complementary. Over 4,000 names are dealt with and there are signs of lack of space. A high standard of scholarship is maintained throughout, and the large proportion of conjectural etymologizing is probably inevitable. Wallenberg, though writing from Uppsala, firmly criticizes Zachrisson's extreme efforts to minimize the importance of personal names as place-name elements and to substitute a host of dubious toponymics. The hundreds are arranged in the order of Hasted's famous *History*. A number of names of places formerly in Kent, but now transferred to the London administrative area, are most conveniently included.

T. B. F. Eminson's much less ambitious book on the place-names of part of Lincolnshire follows,²⁹ in general, the plan of

²⁸ *The Place-names of Kent*, by J. K. Wallenberg. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeriaktiebolag. pp. xx+626. 1934.

²⁹ *The Place and River Names of the West Riding of Lindsey, Lincolnshire*, by T. B. F. Eminson. Lincoln: Ruddock. pp. 288.

the Place-name Society's volumes, but the writer seems not quite in touch with the most recent developments of philological science. There is an interesting introduction on historical lines, and a bibliography, but no index. Much entirely new information comes to light in the course of the book—the treatment of *Lincoln* being especially full and stimulating.

Sir E. Johnson-Ferguson has written a somewhat summary, yet interesting account of Dumfriesshire place-names,³⁰ omitting those that seemed to him to be 'of no particular interest', as he tells us, along with a good many others. There is an index at the beginning, and a useful introduction on the Norse and Gaelic elements in the material to be studied together with some historical information. Johnson-Ferguson has to complain, as do almost all students of Scottish place-names, of the lack of material earlier than the fifteenth century; and his unusually difficult task is rendered harder still by his lack of specialized linguistic training. Nevertheless, he has collected some most valuable material.

R. E. Zachrisson, in *Uncompounded Low-German -ing- names containing Personal Names* (*Studia Neophilologica*, vii), continues his onslaught on the personal origin of such names from vol. vi of the same journal (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 45), and further seeks a topographic origin for these supposed personal elements. As Wallenberg shows, in his book on Kentish place-names noticed above, he may be thought to have carried his favourite theory in somewhat too sweeping a manner.

Eilert Ekwall shows how the heathen deities whose names survive in *Tuesday* and *Friday* appear as the first elements of some place-names not hitherto so explained: e.g. the Warwickshire *Tysoe* and the Gloucestershire *Fretherne*. It is in *Eng. Stud.*, lxx, and is headed *Some Notes on English Place-names containing the names of heathen deities*.

In *Eng. Stud.*, too, R. E. Zachrisson gives a select list with commentary of *English Place-name Compounds containing Descriptive Names in the Genitive*.

Bruce Dickins's article *Latin Additions to Place- and Parish-*

³⁰ *The Place-names of Dumfriesshire*, by Sir Edward Johnson-Ferguson. Dumfries: Courier Press. pp. viii + 140.

names of England and Wales, in *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society* (iii, July), gives a fuller list (based on the work of the Place-name Society) than that published in 1910 by Zachrisson in *Lunds Universitets Årskrift* (N.F., Afd. 1, Bd. 7, Nr. 2).

A new and interesting line of study is suggested by L. W. H. Payling in his *Geology and Place-names in Kesteven, with map*, in *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages* (No. 4). He seeks to show the connexion between the geological formation of the land and the distribution of its early inhabitants indicated by its place-names.

Louis H. Gray offers a very speculative etymology of the name *Glastonbury*, argued with considerable learning, in *Speculum* (Jan.).

Next may be very briefly mentioned some books of the year which, though chiefly written for a wide general public, have some slight contribution to make to English studies. There are also a few more learned articles in periodicals.

A. Lloyd James's collection of lectures and papers, on problems that have faced him and the Advisory Committee of the British Broadcasting Corporation,³¹ contains, besides some clear exposition of practical linguistic problems, a paper entitled *Standards in Speech* (read before the Philological Society in 1932). This clearly sets forth the problem as seen by a practising phonetician.

Maria Schubiger has written a thoughtful little monograph on intonation in English,³² starting from the standpoint of De Saussure and Bally. She discusses the emotional and intellectual functions of intonation, the differentiation of parts of speech through tone, &c., and illustrates her statements by some 'tonetic' transcriptions.

Although A. P. Herbert, naturally, often errs through lack of special linguistic knowledge, there is a good deal of learning and sound principle in his collection of papers on current

³¹ *The Broadcast Word*, by A. Lloyd James. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner. pp. xiii+207. 7s. 6d.

³² *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English*, by Maria Schubiger. Cambridge: Heffer. pp. vi+73. 6s.

weaknesses and vicious tendencies in our writing and speech: and he has used the *O.E.D.* to good purpose.³³

Kostitch and Garrido's *English Grammar*³⁴ is an attempt to bring out what is individual in our language by vivid illustration and comparison with the idiom of various foreign tongues. The prepositions are treated in considerable detail, and the novel plan of taking the noun and the article together is adopted because, in the view of the writers, 'they represent one single conception, and the article has no function alone'.

H. Straumann's study of newspaper headlines³⁵ is a full-length examination of the grammatical structure of what the author calls 'Headlinese', together with an historical survey of this recent growth in our language, and a consideration of the psychological and sociological aspects of the subject. The book contains much that will be of interest to the semasiologist, but the material examined is only considered 'synchronously' and without regard to English linguistic history. There is no index.

The grammatical analysis of current English has continued to attract the interest of foreign scholars, largely under the influence of Jespersen. There seems also to be developing a widespread interest in differences between English and American usage. Of these tendencies the remaining articles to be noticed here are examples.

Herbert Koziol, in *Eng. Stud.*, lxx, under the title *Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch einiger neuenglischen Zeitformen*, considers some characteristically English verbal forms which show the marked richness of the language in finely graded distinctions of time in relation to action. He examines 'I have got' (and the American 'I got'), the so-called *Inclusive* and *Retrospective* Presents, *Expanded Tenses*, &c.

R. Volbeda, in his *The 'Definite Forms'* contributed in two articles to *Neophilologus* (xx), examines closely the verbal noun

³³ *What a Word*, by A. P. Herbert. Methuen. pp. 286. 6s.

³⁴ *A Description of English Grammar for Foreign Students*, by George Kostitch and Isabel Garrido. Cambridge: Heffer. pp. x+81. 3s.

³⁵ *Newspaper Headlines: a Study in Linguistic Method*, by Heinrich Straumann. Allen and Unwin. pp. 263. 10s.

in *-ing*, and then deals more generally with some characteristic forms of tense.

G. Kirchner's '*To Feed*' (*tr. v.*) *construed with various objects and prepositions*, in *English Studies* (Dec.), enumerates all kinds of constructions of 'to feed', both literary and colloquial, and distinguishes between some English and American idiomatic uses of this verb.

A. J. Barnouw has an interesting note in *English Studies* (Feb.), on the use of the word *Dutch*. Owing, it would seem, to certain American uses of the word as an equivalent for German, and to some English colloquial practices, the Dutch Government recently decided that in all future English correspondence and publications *Netherlands* should be substituted as the official term, thus striving to bring English into line with the ordinary Dutch usage of the adj. *Nederlands*. Barnouw explains the official Dutch attitude and its historical causes.

It has been found convenient to collect together work of various kinds on purely American topics which may fall within the scope of this chapter by reason of its special interest for the English philologist or the light it throws on the history of English. General linguistics and the promotion of local dialect-research seem at the time to be the most fruitful sources under this head.

Cleanth Brooks, Jnr., has written a scholarly and constructive little book on the dialects of an area which may roughly be described as Alabama-Georgia.³⁶ He has set out the phonology of the dialects with the aid of phonetic symbols, using particularly the work on Negro speech of the author of *Uncle Remus* as compared with the recent findings of L. W. Payne in his *A Word-list from East Alabama* (in *Dialect Notes*, iii). He then traces the origin of these sounds, and reaches two conclusions which seem to correct views common in America: first, that almost everything in the language studied that differs from English pronunciation is to be regarded as the conserving by Southern American speakers of characters of English which

³⁶ *The Relation of the Alabama-Georgia Dialects to the Provincial Dialects of Great Britain*, by Cleanth Brooks, Jnr. Louisiana State Univ. Studies XX. pp. xii+91.

their ancestors carried over from England, with the naturally developing later modifications—that is, that Georgian is more archaic than our own English; and secondly, that the bulk of the peculiar characteristics examined are ultimately of South-Western English origin. The inference that much of the immigration into Georgia and Alabama in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries came from Somerset and Devon and Dorset will be of general interest.

Allen Walker Read's article, *Amphi-Atlantic English* (*English Studies*, Oct.), examines historically the attitude of Englishmen and Americans to one another's speech and writing. With very full illustrations he details the whole history of the growing consciousness of linguistic differences on the two sides of the Atlantic, preserving, himself, a very impartial standpoint.

Dialect Notes (vi, pt. x) contains an account of the continued work now being done in New England and in Virginia towards a projected American Linguistic Atlas, by Hans Kurath. The plan seems to be going forward with profit to our knowledge of earlier English, and it benefits by the experience and scientific technique worked out already by English and continental dialectologists. Further information on the actual methods of the workers on the *Atlas* and their peculiar problems is given by Bernard Bloch in his *Interviewing for the Linguistic Atlas*, in *American Speech* (Feb.).

A. W. Read provides some matter of interest to English lexicography in *Two New England Word-lists*, in *Dialect Notes* (vi, pt. x). He prints lists of additions and corrections to Bartlett's *Dictionary of Americanisms* (1848) by a contemporary, which contain a few scraps of otherwise unrecorded information, besides fresh illustrations of facts already familiar.

Dialect Notes (vi, pt. x) also contains a further instalment (pt. viii) of R. H. Thornton's third volume of his *American Glossary*. The first two volumes of this useful collection were published in 1912; but the rest has had to wait for publication till the American Dialect Society took the printing in hand. This part of the Glossary runs from *Nigger in the woodpile* to *Perique*.

American Speech publishes each quarter some phonetic transcriptions of the actual speech of celebrated contemporary

men—a practice which, when accurately carried out, provides records of real value. For example, in *American Speech* (Feb.), utterances of Professor John S. Kenyon and Senator William Borah are recorded. With these regularly appearing transcriptions we have the intriguing and tantalizing assurance that 'The Editors accept the theory of phonemes'. Jane Zimmermann is the contributor, under the title *Phonetic Transcription*.

Two articles on some of the American vowels will interest phoneticians. Leonard Bloomfield treats of *The Stressed Vowels of American English*, in *Language* (June). Bloomfield deals with 'Central Western Standard English as spoken in Chicago'. As his editor claims, this study 'possesses a more general interest as an example of the technique of analysing phonematically the structure of a dialect'. The treatment is thoroughly scientific and alive, and there are some thought-provoking remarks on the current use of certain phonetic symbols. The second article is by Morris Swadesh, in *Language* (June) also, and is entitled *The Vowels of Chicago English*. Here Swadesh examines Bloomfield's account of the vowels (in the American revised edition of his book *Language*), and points out some minor inaccuracies in detail.

John T. Krumpelmann suggests an etymology for the American word *Hoodlum* from the German *hudel+lump*, through some dialectal variety, comparing the Bavarian vulgar expression *hodalump* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.).

Kemp Malone has written a stimulating survey of the chief general linguistic work of 1933–4 entitled *Some Linguistic Studies of 1933 and 1934* in *M.L.N.*, viii (Dec.). His remarks on dictionary-making made in reviewing the new edition of *Webster* are of special value. It is a pity he did not deal with the work in phonetics in this period.

Priebsch and Collinson's history of the German language contains matter of some value³⁷ to the student of the history of English. Its first part, *From Indo-European to Germanic* (pp. 1–82), summarizes the knowledge needed as a preliminary

³⁷ *The German Language*, by R. Priebsch and W. E. Collinson. Faber and Faber. pp. xvii+434+map. 18s.

to the study of any Gmc. language, though there are errors of detail. English (OE. from the eighth century) loan-words in OHG. and modern Anglicisms of quite recent introduction into German are very briefly touched upon on pp. 241 and 245 respectively. But the book seems to aim at covering too much ground in comparatively little space, and hence is very uneven.

III

OLD ENGLISH

By DAISY E. MARTIN CLARKE

SUBSTANTIAL work has been contributed to Old English Studies this year. The range of treatment is wider than usual; in addition to the usual textual editing palaeography, language, literature, archaeology, philosophy, and even anthropology (in the guise of the social customs of barbaric peoples) arrest the attention of a reader of the 1935 publications.

E. E. Wardale in her *Old English Literature*¹ has provided students of Old English with a survey of certain aspects of verse and prose. Her book is characterized throughout by the sound use of the work of other scholars together with interesting suggestions arising out of her own scholarship. Her presentation of subject-matter and her style are marked by lucidity and precision. Moreover, experience in university teaching has enabled her to make her book particularly useful for undergraduate students.

The writer begins by giving such students a very useful general survey of both verse and prose, though in attempting such a survey rather more attention might perhaps have been given to the fact that much Old English literature has been lost. Much of chapter i is devoted to the origins of Old English heroic verse, its classification and development, the effect of Christianity on its quality and other influences at work on it. There are pages on the technique of the verse, though no reference to Sievers's more recent views. It is a special characteristic of this book that the writer makes constant use of the relationship between Old English and Old Saxon literature.

Chapters ii–v (inclusive) treat of poems with 'pagan subjects'. Miss Wardale adopts the method of paraphrase and some translation of the texts in order to present her material to her readers. These chapters deal fully with the early lyric, the epic (*Beowulf*)

¹ *Chapters on Old English Literature*, by E. E. Wardale. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner. pp. x + 310. 8s. 6d.

and the heroic legend, but not so fully with gnomic verse and the charms. In the former groups the writer gives in some detail views already published, adding constantly suggestions of her own which illustrate detail and also reveal views about Old English poetry in general. It is a pity that she could not give us more work on the gnomic group, which requires further detailed study.

Chapters vi and vii describe the so-called Cædmon and Cynewulf poems, presenting these poems with reference to their main characteristics and problems, their relationship with other Old English verse and also the way in which they have been adapted to pagan religious and literary ideas. The same full treatment is given to the later historical lays, but here the writer does not seem to have made use of comparatively recent work on *Maldon*, work which would almost certainly have modified her point of view.

Miss Wardale has given much less room to Old English prose. She concentrates her attention on the standard reached in prose style and on details in its development, illustrating such development by especial reference to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The treatment, moreover, of such subjects as the sources of the *Chronicle*, discussion as to its authorship, the personality and life of Alfred, is brief.

In her Preface the writer says something about the difficulty of making translations from Old English, viz. of conveying the manner as well as the thought to the reader. She has adopted a consistent manner in all her verse translations in order to accomplish this. Her interpretation of the straightforward passages is orthodox, though she uses her own punctuation. In the less straightforward passages she has some interesting interpretations as, e.g., when in *The Wanderer* she translates *secga geseldan* as a kenning for 'memories'. However, there are some phrases in both verse and prose where the translation is not satisfactory. We may compare *The Wanderer*: *wyrmlicum-fah* 'bright with serpent shapes'; annal 893 of the *Parker Chronicle* 'as near as he could find space for woodfastness and waterfastness'; and since at least 1918 it has seemed clear that the *huilpan sweg* is the cry of the godwit and not of the curlew.

Miss Wardale has entitled her Bibliography, 'some books

recommended', but even with this modest title it is not a satisfactory list. The books selected are not necessarily the best available. There are curious omissions, as, for example, when Attenborough's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Laws is mentioned, but not Miss Robertson's. The book, however, is so useful and fills such a need that it is with thanks to the writer that this note must be concluded. Her colleagues and older students of Old English literature (many of them taught by her) are indebted for many suggestions and the lucid treatment of complicated subjects: while undergraduates will find such a survey very valuable, both as an introduction and as a book of reference, when Old English verse is already familiar.

To extend the range of consideration of Old English of Miss Wardale's survey the student is recommended to turn to certain chapters in R. H. Hodgkin's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*² dealing with Old English literature and learning in Alfred's reign. In vol. II, xvii, xviii, and xx he deals with the Alfredian prose documents primarily from the point of view of the historian, showing how they reveal the needs and state of the nation and the mental outlook of the king. Although he does not go into great detail, he indicates reasons for deciding on the authorship and chronology of the Alfredian documents and notes the points representing the personal outlook of the king. He admits that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is hardest to place but indicates without dogmatizing the probable sources of its records at different dates. In xx he attempts an estimate of the personality and achievement of Alfred, showing that mental and spiritual development may be traced in the books in which he was interested. The writer avows that Alfred's personality and exploits did not fire the imagination of the nation as did those of the old 'heroic' age, but that, as time passed, he became more popular till as the source of national wisdom and proverb lore he was known as *Engle hirde* and *Engle derling*. Hodgkin uses translations from Old English freely, taking some from those by Sedgefield in his edition of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, but most from R. K. Gordon's volume of translated Old English verse.

² *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, by R. H. Hodgkin. 2 vols. O.U.P. pp. xxvii and xii + 748. 30s.

A brief reference must also be given to the history generally, partly because the writer has 'kept in mind students of the Old English language who wish to understand the background of its literature' and partly because we have here no mere political history but a description of the culture, art, and thought of the Anglo-Saxon people. Hodgkin makes clear in his Preface that he has used all the important work available which in any way bears on his subject, 'the more perfected methods of archaeology', 'new interpretations of constitutional data', philological examinations of the problems of Old English literature, work on place-names, on charters, and on the art of the Anglo-Saxons. Indeed, the volumes are lavishly and finely illustrated: for this alone students of Old English will be grateful, as also for the author's full consideration (side by side with his other material) of the finds and theories of archaeologists. This is an important feature of his book, though he admits that 'Saxon archaeology has not yet attained to a high degree of scientific security', and that he can use its dicta often only as an 'interim report'.

This is not the place to attempt any estimate of the historical achievement of these volumes, though we may mention the author's aim as an 'attempt to adjust the new views and the old'. He has given his readers a full equipment of maps, genealogical trees, and a supremely valuable chronological table ranging from the fourth century to the death of Alfred, and covering items connected with the Empire, the church, Britain, Celtic lands, and northern Europe. The two published volumes lead up to King Alfred: any that may follow will treat of his influence and that of the Danes up to the Conquest. Each item in the narrative is not documented, but in general there are copious references to both primary and secondary sources, in the notes at the end of each volume.

The writer's attitude towards Old English verse and prose is naturally that of the historian, but literary criticism when it occurs is in general sound and up to date.

To commemorate the year 1935, the twelve hundredth anniversary of the death of the Venerable Bede, a set of essays³

³ *Bede, his Life, Times and Writings*, edited by A. Hamilton Thompson. O.U.P. pp. xii+277. 15s.

from modern scholars has been published to give some authoritative estimate of Bede and his work. The Bishop of Durham himself contributes an Introduction in which, quoting from the *Hibbert Journal*, he says: 'He has been described as the father of English History. He was much more than that, he was . . . the Father of all the Middle Ages.'

Essays are contributed on his life by the Professor of History at Durham; on his age by the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. Most suitably these two essays are supported, the first by a history of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow together with some account of the modern buildings at both sites (contributed by Sir Charles Peers); and the second by a full account of Northumbrian Monasticism written with all the erudition one has come to associate with Hamilton Thompson's work. Further essays are included, on Bede as historian (from the Professor of Medieval and Modern History at Bonn University); as theologian (from the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford) and as hagiographer (from the Reader in English at Durham University).

The late Provost of Eton College in his palaeographical essay confines his attention almost entirely to the manuscripts of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, reminding us that more than 130 manuscripts, dating over 700 years and preserved in at least forty libraries, do not complete the list for this work alone. Besides giving some account of the Latin versions of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, M. R. James refers to the Old English version of the same work. There are five manuscripts extant dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries. The writer's concluding paragraphs deal with the question of the autographs of Bede and state that apart from the traditional ascription of work to him there is little evidence in their favour. An account of Bede's library by the Professor of History in Cornell University completes the tally of the essays.

For the student of Old English it is primarily Bede's intimate association with the art and culture of Northumbria in the seventh and eighth centuries that makes his work important. His *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, the *Historia Abbatum*, and the two lives of St. Cuthbert (one in hexameters) are the main source of the information we have for this period in

English history. The fully documented and detailed treatment of Bede's life and works by C. E. Whiting is characteristic of the other essays also, while those estimating him as historian, theologian, and hagiographer are of equal value to the student in Old English, who is referred to them for details.

Bede's extant writing in Old English is slight. In addition, however, to extant works, we know he was translating St. John's Gospel into Old English while he was dying. Whiting, while discussing Latin works sometimes ascribed to Bede, would include a poem *De Die Judicii* (which later appeared in Old English as *Be Domes Daege*), and referring to the *De Obitu Baedae* says, when dying 'he quoted five Old English lines on the departure of the soul from the body'. A small point of criticism —there are some errors in the indexing which should be corrected at the earliest opportunity.

A. C. Bartlett in *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*⁴ deals with 'the rhetorically developed style' which she wishes to describe as the peculiar property of Anglo-Saxon poetry in its most finished form. In her Foreword she defines the scope of her work, viz. the long rhetorical unit in Anglo-Saxon poetry with its definite and intentional structural pattern. She adds later that she is not concerned 'with the route by which such patterns and devices came into Anglo-Saxon.... I shall not in this book attempt to establish any relationship between Anglo-Saxon rhetoric and Old Icelandic on the one hand or between Anglo-Saxon rhetoric and Latin on the other.' In four chapters, therefore, she gives examples and comments on 'the patterns of the Anglo-Saxon rhetorical verse paragraph', calling each chapter by a descriptive name, e.g., 'Envelope', 'Parallel', 'Incremental', 'Rhythymical'. The name 'Envelope' is taken from W. M. Hart's *Ballad and Epic* ('a parallelism ... something like the "envelope figure" of the Psalms'); 'Parallel' and 'Rhythymical' are self-explanatory. 'Incremental' signifies a series of steps in narrative style cumulative in force (cp. *Beow.*, 702b-736a).

⁴ *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, by Adeline Courtney Bartlett. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. viii + 130. 11s. 6d.

Chapter vi examines, under the title 'Decorative Inset', the appearance in poetic style of gnomic, homiletic, elegiac, lyrical, runic, descriptive and narrative elements; while a further chapter, 'Conventional Device', deals with the technique of introductory and concluding formulae and also with the characteristics of direct speech.

The work done in these chapters is useful. The writer's examples are often well chosen though some could be improved by the addition of a longer comment, to make clear that the device is not, as the writer herself puts it, 'a mere repetition of a phrase or phrases within the space of ten, twenty or a hundred lines'. She probably realizes herself the very slight treatment she has given to her 'Rhythmical Pattern' by dealing only with the expanded line in relationship to verse paragraph. In her last chapter the writer suggests some conclusions, viz. (1) the form (of a verse paragraph) often seems to be chosen for the sake of ornament, not for the sake of the meaning; (2) the cumulative effect of all these patterns is to emphasize the non-narrative feeling of Anglo-Saxon epic (one might cite Klaeber's much more clearly expressed phrase 'mere objective narration is not the chief aim' of the Old English poet), and (3) the interpretation of Anglo-Saxon verse as a poetic tapestry helps in the appreciation of the poetic style.

Up to this point, within the very limited scope indicated in her Foreword, some useful work has been done, but here the writer apparently changes her mind and attempts in the few remaining pages of her book to put forward a view about the influences which have been at work on Anglo-Saxon poetic style. Her case for Latin influence is based on subjective, negative arguments, references to the views of other critics and some reproachful questions in colloquial language, and to these we may add some half a dozen references, among the examples cited in earlier chapters, to possible sources of influence.

The subject on which she here embarks is a highly controversial one only to be elucidated by considering a much wider range of example (Germanic and classical) than the writer has attempted. Miss Bartlett, for example, has not read Miss Phillpotts's convincing article on the possible Norse influence on the style of *Maldon*, a clear example of the limited scope of her

study. There is room for work on both classes of subject, the narrower and the wider: it is a pity that the writer did not make up her mind to adhere to either the one or the other.

R. Girvan's *Beowulf and the Seventh Century*⁵ represents three lectures given at University College, London, and printed almost identically as delivered. Lecture I is devoted to the language of the poem. The writer's main theme is that the vocabulary of Old English poetry is essentially that of everyday (literary) use and that the diction of *Beowulf* (apart from a handful of poetic archaisms) is what we meet elsewhere in Old English verse. This latter statement he modifies, however, by noting the numbers and types of compounds in *Beowulf*, and asks whether these may be due to the poem belonging to an earlier stage of the language.

Girvan next takes up dialect forms and forms that are chronologically discrepant. There are, he says, extremely few which are essential to verse and metre. 'I do not think there is any example of an essential form which can be maintained as really late.' Those who allocate the poem to the Northumbrian dialect and to pre-eighth century must, however, attribute the presence of back mutation of *a* in the poem to copyists. When dealing with such linguistic features as contraction, apocope and syncope and syntax, he notes that the oldest changes noted belong to the early seventh century, but in view of Christian references these would have to be ascribed to after 650.

Girvan's third lecture deals with Folk-tale and History. He emphasizes the high degree of accuracy in the accounts of Hygelac's death and suggests that this is significant of what we may expect from the poem historically. In his discussion of anomalies in the poem he seems to be in general agreement with the view of Axel Olrik that 'the poet knew Geat history but only Danish heroic tradition as preserved in poetry'. We ought to accept, therefore, as historic fact that Beowulf was the nephew of Hygelac and ultimately king of the Geats. For his detailed elaboration of this the reader is referred to the original:

⁵ *Beowulf and the Seventh Century*, by Ritchie Girvan. Methuen. pp. viii + 86. 3s. 6d.

for even if three of the main arguments brought forward by protagonists of the opposing view can be countered, yet Girvan's own argument needs further elaboration and example.

We have here three lectures putting forward a theory about *Beowulf* and the seventh century. In its written form it is not adequate. Indeed its writer says, 'it was inevitable that conclusions should be stated without setting forth the evidence on which they are based'. The subject-matter to be examined in any such theorizing is too wide, complex, and controversial to be dealt with effectively under the conditions which have governed the production of Girvan's book. His suggestions are often interesting; their presentation in their present form is not convincing. Elaboration in a series of articles would have drawn attention to these interesting views more effectively.

W. J. Sedgefield⁶ in his first edition of the *Beowulf*, twenty-five years ago, limited the scope of treatment in his Introduction to an outline of the more important facts established and theories hazarded; his notes to what was essential for textual understanding, and his treatment of the text to what would be considered essentially helpful to students. His new edition, though revised and partly rewritten, has, however, substantially the same range of treatment with special emphasis laid on the compilation of the text of the poem and its more exact interpretation. It does not compete with an edition like that of Klaeber's.

The composition of the volume is much what it was in 1910 with the addition of an Appendix containing a résumé of the story of Grettir Asmundarson. As one would expect, the brief selected Bibliography is very much changed as Sedgefield's first edition dates before the publication of all the outstanding work on *Beowulf* problems which have appeared since the first decade of the century. All this comparatively recent work on the poem has led to alterations in the Introduction, especially to a rearrangement and expansion of the sections on Germanic History and Legend, the Folk-tale Elements and unity of authorship. The writer now accepts Panzer's folk-tale

⁶ *Beowulf*, ed. by W. J. Sedgefield. (3rd ed.) Manchester Univ. Press. pp. xxxv + 250. 10s. 6d.

theories and abandons the idea that the Beowulf-Grendel story was ultimately derived from myth. He endorses Brandl's dictum in favour of unity of authorship, explaining discrepancies in the poem by deciding that the poet wavered between the style of the epic and that of the minstrel's lay.

'*Beowulf* looks like an experiment in a new genre . . . the result is not an epic which postulates an advanced culture but a romance of a quite original type. The digressions occupying over 400 lines of our poem are like windows from which we get glimpses of a vast body of saga material . . . once enshrined in hero-lays sung by bards.'

Many who may well endorse Sedgefield's remarks about a new genre of poetry will disagree with his use of the term 'romance' for *Beowulf*.

In the conclusions enumerated as probable at the end of his Introduction the writer emphasizes that the poem is a unit, original and indigenous to the Anglo-Saxons; that its poet was refined in mind, a cleric who in some way became familiar with lays treating of Scandinavian and other Germanic heroes; that the original text was in Anglian and that it was copied into West-Saxon by an educated man.

In his Preface to his new edition Sedgefield states that he has once again scrutinized the *Beowulf* manuscript, compared it with the phototypes made by Zupitza, and has had folio 179 examined by Dr. Robin Flower with the help of the ultra-violet lamp. The result of this new inspection has led to modification in the text of eight lines of folio 179: these may be compared with Klaeber's readings which are based on the notes of Chambers as well as on those of Zupitza. In lines 2210-30, Sedgefield claims to have made out one or two readings differently from these scholars, and although unable to throw any light on interpretation, he disagrees with Zupitza's comment on the hopelessly corrupt hemistich 2226^b.

With regard to textual emendation, in addition to those accepted generally by editors, his view is that it is better ('for the student') to admit emendations which substitute sense for nonsense, under certain conditions. We may compare his emendation of manuscript reading *7 icge* in l. 1107 to *ond(l)icge* (a nonce word) meaning 'stored'. If we take some twelve

readings which differ from readings in the 1910 edition, we find the editor has emended the manuscript much more frequently. He does not always give the reason for the change and on some occasions at any rate his notes are not full enough to be convincing. He has made a thorough analysis of the metre of the poem and used this widely as a help in textual criticism (cp. Appendix I).

In his selections from the Parker text of the *Chronicle*,⁷ A. H. Smith adds a sixth volume to the Old English texts published by Methuen. His aim is to present a reliable text and to consider some of the problems involved in a study of the Chronicle, within the scope of his edition. Details in the presentation of the text agree in general with those already published in this series, but here the editor is especially indebted to Plummer's, the standard text, though he indicates that he has found errors in Plummer's readings. His list of these, however, requires further explanation in order to show what is the final reading of the text. This need for amplification is also noticeable in the comments on meaning, and the references printed below the text, particularly so because again and again when Smith has written at greater length the advantage to the student is obvious (contrast, e.g., p. 36²⁷ with p. 32¹⁷). The identity of the place-names is of course much more exact than that of older editions as much work has been done on this subject of recent years by A. H. Smith himself as well as by others. A map would have been a most useful addition. The text is completed by the usual Glossary and select Bibliography. Even if not claiming to be complete the latter should contain Liebermann's article in *Archiv*, civ (1900).

The Introduction falls into three sections, Versions and Origins of the Chronicle; Chronology; and the language of the Parker manuscript. Under the first, the editor gives a brief orthodox account of the manuscripts but refers also to a sixteenth-century transcript of the badly burnt manuscript, Cotton Otho B. xi, only recently acquired by the British Museum. This manuscript B.M. Add. 43703 was briefly described by Dr.

⁷ *The Parker Chronicle (832-900)*, ed. by A. H. Smith. Methuen. pp. viii + 72. 2s.

Robin Flower in the *British Museum Quarterly*, viii. In his opinion it is most probable that Lambard's copy of the same manuscript, mentioned by Plummer (though not seen by him), was made from Nowell's transcript (mentioned above), and it is good news that such an important manuscript is to be described in detail by Flower when he edits an unknown Old English alliterative poem from the same manuscript, this year. In this section, too, the date of the original Chronicle is discussed with the comment: 'it is almost impossible to reconstruct the character of the original'. Moreover, the editor, unlike Plummer (in 1892) and Hodgkin (in 1935), is not convinced that Alfred himself wrote the Chronicle. He brings forward no new evidence in support of his position but differs in his interpretation of that already available. There is a useful section on Chronology based on M. L. R. Beaven's work and finally an account of the orthography and style of the Parker manuscript.

R. Willard in his two Old English Apocrypha⁸ presents two studies arising from his work on the Old English homily, *The Apocryphon of the Seven Heavens* and *The Three Utterances*. The former is to be found in manuscript C.C.C.C. 41, in the margins of an Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, and Willard prints what he calls parts V (the seven heavens enumerated), VI (the transit of the soul), and VII (a description of hell), expanding abbreviations, punctuating, and capitalizing, and emending (with footnotes which contain the manuscript readings). The writer next discusses difficulties of interpretation by reference to other known versions of this theme, considering in some detail the technical names and epithets ascribed to the seven heavens, the doors of the heavens, the guardian angels, the cardinal virtues, and the transit of the soul. The descent of the soul through the twelve circles of hell (part VII) is also described in another Old English homily (unpublished but extant in manuscripts Cotton Faustina A. ix Hom. iv (Wanley), from which Willard quotes, and C.C.C.C. 302 Hom. x (Wanley)). The Old English versions have certain

⁸ *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*, by Rudolph Willard. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, xxx.) Leipzig: Tauchnitz. pp. viii + 149. RM. 8.

features in common, i.e. when they speak of the devil as lying on his back bound with fiery chains. On p. 28 the writer gives an outline of the cursus of the soul, and on p. 30 some account of the possible relationship of the various accounts to one another.

The latter and larger half of the book deals with *The Three Utterances of the Soul*, presenting the hitherto unpublished texts of three Old English homilies dealing with this subject, manuscripts, Hatton 114; Cotton Faustina A. ix; and Junius 85 and 86 together with the text of the Latin homily from manuscript Latin 2628 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, printed by Louise Dudley in *The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and Soul* and the Old Irish Story called *The Two Deaths*, edited by C. Marstrander in *Eriu* (1911). The two last are given as translated by their respective editors. In the chapter called *The Setting* the writer gives careful consideration to these different versions of the theme and shows that their characteristics point to a connexion with the so-called *Vision of Paul*, a vision both popular and widely known.

The remaining chapters examine the characteristics of the narrative which show variation in the different versions. The writer deals for example with 'Angels of Death', *Suscitate animam leniter* and the Order of Parts, The Escort and Chant, and the Utterances themselves. In his Preface he indicates that in examining such a subject he has had to go very far afield. The apocryphal material which he uses is only familiar to a limited number of students, but his treatment impresses one as thorough and his assessment as well judged.

Although not an Old English text, we must draw attention to W. Jaager's edition of Bede's Latin metrical life of St. Cuthbert⁹ which appears this year with a full introduction and critical text.

Finally we would add two preliminary notes, one on the edition of *Das altenglische Traumgesicht vom Kreuz*,¹⁰ edited by

⁹ *Beda's metrische Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, by Werner Jaager. (Palaestra, 198.) Leipzig: Mayer and Müller. pp. vi+136. RM. 9.

¹⁰ *Das altenglische Traumgesicht vom Kreuz*, by Hans Bülow. (Anglist. Forsch. 78.) Heidelberg: Winter. pp. 8+185. RM. 10.

Hans Bülow, and the other, *Zur Vorgeschichte des 'Beowulf'*,¹¹ by W. A. Berendsohn. We hope to make further comments on both these books next year.

Our next section deals with articles written on the subject of *Beowulf*.

Gustav Hübener in *R.E.S.* (April) gives readers in a short article on *Beowulf and Germanic Exorcism* the gist of the views he has been expressing and developing during past years. It is his object to insist upon the relationship between such a plot as that of the *Beowulf* and the old custom of exorcism. To quote: 'we hope that our idea of "heroic exorcism" is and will be the key to the chief treasure vault of the saga tradition.'

Two aspects at any rate of this unorthodox point of view, it seems to us, justify students of Old English literature in giving a sympathetic consideration to Hübener's article here and to his writings elsewhere (cp. especially, *England und die Gesittungsgrundlage der europäischen Frühgeschichte*, 1930). First, the writer, even while drawing attention consistently to the general connexion between the extant literary form of the Germanic saga and exorcistic customs, boldly declares that much work remains to be done on detail. Secondly it seems clear, to use a concrete analogy, that with Hübener as with other scholars the *Beowulf* is regarded as containing within itself layers of culture, superimposed one on the other even as in San Clemente in Rome one church is situated on top of its fellow, each representing a period of development in the religious faith of mankind. The acceptance of Hübener's suggestion may well enrich the general content of *Beowulf* without necessarily disproving views held of other scholars.

In outline, Hübener's article maintains first that the purely literary explanation of the similarity between the great 'sagas' of Germanic tradition is inadequate. Their unique names, historical framework, and their tone are opposed to their being considered merely as products of the imagination. If much in them, however, is due to the literary imagination, why is it that

¹¹ *Zur Vorgeschichte des 'Beowulf'*, by W. A. Berendsohn. Kopenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard. pp. 302. 15 kr.

man's imagination is so preoccupied with this special form of subject, viz. the heroic fight against demons like Grendel or Glamr? Hübener would explain it by pointing to a real existent early European custom, viz. the expulsion of obsessions, a custom believed in by our ancestors as by other races in the world.

The rest of the article gathers together under six different headings certain facts and considerations. Belief in and practice of exorcism is found throughout the world with different attendant characteristics, and closer examination of the great Germanic sagas shows that some of these characteristics are present in them. As Germanic civilization struggled out of its predominantly magic past and the characteristic features of the Heroic Age society appeared, it was natural that the central figure of the society, the most courageous leader, should have to fight that which had filled earlier society with fear, viz. the attack by demons. Hübener has found many examples in modern Europe of the practice of exorcism. One may add that they are not wholly lacking in Britain.

The last two sections of the article from their very nature are the most incomplete. The writer indicates that much work needs to be done in order to show how far literary imagination has played a part in the structure of these sagas, but he insists that only by paying attention to the underlying connexion with exorcism will the problem of the literary embellishment of the sagas be solved. He indicates that some of them clearly seem to be nearer to the magic past than others. In his last section he considers a few examples. Hübener has set himself a difficult task in trying to give in a brief article a wide-reaching theory like this, though English readers must be obliged to him for the opportunity of having had attention drawn to it in this way.

In *Archiv* (June) Hope Traver writes on *Beowulf* 648–649 once more. She ventures to put forward a new interpretation of the *Beowulf* textual difficulty because of the difference of opinions on it expressed by well-known scholars. Many of these emend l. 648: others write *opðe* (l. 649) as *op ðe* (= 'until'). The former translate 'after they could no longer see', &c.; the latter (cf. Klaeber) 'from the time that they could see the

light of the sun, until night came'. Miss Traver would make no alteration in the manuscript reading and would translate (following up 'for he knew that a fight was purposed for the foe in the high hall'), 'afterwards they might either see the sunlight or night darkening over all, shadowed shapes would have come striding on, black under welkin'.

She supports her proposal by referring to the technical meaning of *þing gehegan* and from the use of *scriðan* in *Beowulf*. She also examines the general style of the poem and notes that *Beowulf* himself (ll. 280–5) suggests to the coast-guard alternative results which might arise from his attack on Grendel. Miss Traver elaborates her interpretation with some success, suggesting by consideration of the general context that the verse is heightened by this interpretation of the narrative. The weakness in her interpretation seems to lie in the syntactical connexion of ll. 649 and 650.

In a letter to the *T.L.S.* (Nov. 9), headed *Beowulf's Fight with Grendel*, Constance Davies gives an account of the attacks made by a monster, Y Gwr Blewog (i.e. Hairy Man) on a farm-house on Bwlch Mwlchan in which many details resemble those of the stories dealing with trolls in *Beowulf* and *Grettissaga*. This Welsh legend handed down orally was repeated recently to the writer. On 23 November, referring to the above letter, A. Mackenzie suggests, with illustrations, that it is in Scotland rather than in Wales that the Grendel story will find its closest analogies.

On 14 December Katherine M. Buck writes that the antiquary, Edward Llwyd, in 1695 noted the legend of Y Gwr Blewog and she gives parallels to and traces of this story in several literatures. We may remind readers that it was in Wales that Sir Gawain met and fought with the woodwose, a monster of troll stock and well described as a 'gigantic man covered all over with red hair'.

In *Eng. Stud.* (Jan.) A. E. Du Bois writes on *Beowulf 1107 and 2577: Hoards, Swords and Shields*, suggesting meanings for the two adjectives *icge, incge*. He wishes to translate both words by 'barbarous, heathen' with the implication also 'ancient and marvellous': he connects them both with the god Ing. By an

argument very much restricted he suggests first that a meaning can be arrived at by reference to such adjectives as *eotenisc* and *entisc*, which are commonly used in the description of swords and hoards. This by no means certain proposition is followed by further discussion of which the author himself says: 'beyond probability the evidence is scant and within probability the theory is perhaps too pat . . . to be trusted'. The present reviewer refers the reader to the article itself for further information.

In *Eng. Stud.* (April), published in honour of the seventieth birthday of Karl Luick, W. Krogmann writes on *Altengl. antid und seine Sippe*. The word *antid* (*Beowulf*, 219) has already been examined both from the point of view of its linguistic history and the possible length of Beowulf's voyage to Hroðgar's capital. In almost all respects Krogmann supports Sievers's linguistic analysis of the passage. It is with the exact meaning of *antid* that he is concerned: he would translate the whole phrase, 'am anderen Tage nach der vorgesehenen Zeit'.

By reference to the use of analogous words in Old English, Old Norse, and Old Saxon Krogmann extends the range of inquiry made by Sievers. The first element in *antid*, he contends, has the significance 'bestimmt' or 'festgesetzt'. As the title indicates, the writer does not consider the question from the point of view of the possible length of Beowulf's voyage.

In the same number of *Eng. Stud.* Kemp Malone contributes some reflections on the name of Healfdene in *Beowulf*. Healfdene was probably illegitimate from the form of his name and from Scandinavian records. In *Beowulf* he is given a divine parent, i.e. Beowulf who corresponds to the Beow of the West Saxon genealogies, a supernatural personage. However, from Scandinavian sources his father seems to have been a certain Harold. The name (in the genitive plural) is used in the Finn episode, 1069, as a family or tribal name. Hnæf is said to be *Hæleð Healf-Dena*: elsewhere in the story he and his men are identified with the Danes. Despite this, in no account of the Danish royal family do Hnæf or his father, Hōc, play a part as king or prince: yet there is clearly a connexion. Malone suggests that this connexion is to be found in the fact that Hnæf

(a contemporary of Hengest and Horsa) would belong to the beginning of the fifth century and therefore far from being a descendant of Healfdene might be his grandfather.

In his *Kommentar zum Beowulf* J. Hoops, writing on l. 457, contented himself with giving the usual emendations for this line and stating that Klaeber's interpretation appeared the best, viz. 'because of deeds done'. But he added that no emendation or interpretation was wholly satisfactory. In the April number of *Eng. Stud.* he considers *Beowulf* 457 f.: *For were fyhtum and for ārstafum* further, with full references to all suggestions hitherto made, and indicates that not only does the manuscript reading *fere fyhtum* need an emendation which shall restore the alliteration but one that shall elucidate the form *fere*. Moreover, the epithet chosen must offer a meaning parallel to the phrase in the following line, viz. *for arstafum*. Hoops considers that Grundtvig's emendation to *for were-fyhtum* satisfies one of these needs and he would translate 'for the purpose of defensive fighting' (i.e. referring not to the past but to the future fight against Grendel). Moreover, the *ar-* of *arstafas* may be taken to mean 'help' as in the *Riddles*. Hoops compares l. 382, *Hine halig God for arstafum us asende . . . wið Grendles gryre*. Hence the two epithets may be considered as parallel in meaning.

In *M.L.N.* (Feb.) A. E. Du Bois translates *Beowulf* 489–490, indicating by elaboration the exact meaning of this disputed passage: 'But sit down and eat (the hall is yours, as you have requested), and in the hall (before the fight, however doubtful its outcome), reckon on victory for men (over Grendel who can hardly be called a man) as you are inclined to do (though I know what happened to my Danes).'

In the same number F. G. Cassidy puts forward *A Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in Beowulf* (745b–749), different from that usually accepted. He would put a semicolon after *hige-þihtigne* and take *rinc* as nominative case. At the word *rinc* the poet would begin to talk of Beowulf's response to the fiend's grappling. One additional point might be suggested, viz. the insertion of an *l* in *invitþancum*. This word would then become *invitþanclum* and would naturally refer to Grendel.

In *J.E.G.P.* (Jan.) N. E. Eliason contributes a note on the *Wulfhlið* in *Beowulf* 1358 in which he suggests that instead of the word conveying a picture of a remote spot, the retreat of wolves, it conjures up 'a cliff where wolves lurked feeding upon animal and human carcases'.

E. V. Gordon in *Med. Æv.* (Oct.) writes an article on *Wealhþeow and related names*. In this he elaborates the view that the name of Hroðgar's queen Wealhðeow means 'chosen servant' and that it is an old one, not a descriptive one coined by the poet. The Old English form has its counterpart in the Old Norse masculine name *Valþjófr*, the first element of which by reference to Schönfield's collection of old proper names can mean 'chosen, beloved' as well as 'foreign'. As for *þjófr*, it has been accepted for some sixty years now, when it is the second element in a proper name, as a doublet of *ther* (= servant).

Names, however, in which this element appears are given in early times to nobly-born folk, and further scrutiny of their etymology shows that the bearers in many cases would seem to be either in the service of a god or devoted to some ideal. Finally the writer suggests that the unusual gender of *Wealhþeow* may be elucidated by reference to O.H.G. names of the same type, which can be either masculine or feminine gender and which types may have become specialized as masculine gender in Old Norse.

Several articles dealing with subjects outside Beowulf are contributed in *Eng. Stud.* (Jan.). W. Horn gives a carefully worked out note on the meaning of Old English *Hwæpere*. He indicates that words suggesting contrast like New German *doch* and *dennoch*; Latin *sed* and *autem*; Old English *ac*, *þeah* *hwæpere*, New English *nevertheless*, *notwithstanding*, *despite of all*, show evolving forms which in course of time have either been strengthened in significance or have been ousted.

By careful comparison with the cognate OHG. form and examples from the different periods of English, Horn shows that the probabilities are that Old English *hwæpere* originally was part of a phrase *Þeah þū zehwæpere*, although at a glance it must first be linked with the interrogative pronoun, *hwæper*. Out of

this arises the meaning (common in OE.) 'nevertheless' (literally, 'in any case'). An interesting sample of the way in which linguistic forms and meanings develop.

In the same number Max Förster contributes an article on *Altenglisch stōr, ein altirisches Lehnwort*. He draws attention to the difficulty of ascribing the Old English form, with its nominative *stōr*, to Latin *storax* as, for example, when it is compared with Old English *persoc* (*persic*) from Latin *persicum* (peach). This doubt about the origin of *stōr* is supported by Pogatscher. Förster next indicates the widespread influence of Irish on the Old English language, especially on the vocabulary of church and monastic practice. He cites a number of Irish loans already accepted as such and adds two more recently suggested in Alfred's *œstel* and Ælfric's *cine*. Finally he shows on what etymological grounds he gives Old English *stōr* an immediate Irish origin. The article, though brief, contains much useful information about words, a feature one begins to look for always in Förster's work.

Under the section *Miszellen* in *Eng. Stud.* (Aug.) W. Krogmann contributes two notes. In the first he examines the etymology of the *Ae. defu* (not *defe* as in Bosworth-Toller, Clark Hall, 1931, and Holthausen 1934). In the second note he joins issue with F. Holthausen who had maintained that the element *Ae. georman-*, *geormen-* (in the name of the flower *Malva erratica*) could not be a participle, as probably its oldest form would be *geormæn-*.

In the same number A. S. C. Ross writes notes on *The Runic Stones at Holy Island*, following up the discussion by C. R. Peers in *Archaeologia*, xxiv (1925). For the detailed information contained in his article readers are referred to the original.

In *Archiv* (June) Bruce Dickins, under *Kleinere Mitteilungen*, contributes a brief note on the runic inscriptions to be found on rings described in the British Museum Guide to Anglo-Saxon Antiquities. While agreeing that the inscriptions are magical he would interpret by reference to an Old English charm for blood stanching.

In the same section, in *Ae. tintreg(a)<*tind-treg(a)*, F. Mezger discusses the derivation of this word, found in both Alfred and

Ælfric's writings. He suggests that it possibly comes from **tind-treg(a)*. From a number of compounds containing *trega* (= misfortune) he suggests that the element *tind* (with other Germanic cognate dialect forms) is probably to be elucidated by reference to OE. *tinnan* (to burn). Holthausen cites the word in his recent *Wörterbuch* only to query its etymology: both writers give the meaning 'Qual, Pein'.

Turning now to subjects other than *Beowulf*, in other periodicals, we note that in *Archiv* (March) Fr. Klaeber gives some textual *Bemerkungen zu altenglischen Dichtungen*. Section 1 deals with the poem printed in Grein-Wülker, ii, p. 217, called *Gebet*, and in *Chapters on the Exeter Book* referred to by R. W. Chambers as *A Prayer*. The text is unsatisfactory even after the attempts to elucidate it made recently by Chambers and Flower—Klaeber suggests readings and interpretations for ll. 4, 21, 47, 70, 84, 86, 90, 94, 97, 107, 115, 118. He uses the reading of the recently published facsimile of the Exeter Book, for the first line, making the first three lines read:

*Age mec se ælmihta God
helpe min se halga Dryhten
þu gesceope heofon and eorþan.*

Similarly Klaeber discusses the words *uhtceare* and *on uhtan* in *Klage der Frau*, ll. 7 and 35; the clause, *ða ic me feran gewat folgað secan* in l. 9 (supporting N. Kershaw's elucidation by reference to Bede 420, 12), and finally discusses the difficulties present in ll. 17–21, and 42 ff. His last note deals with *Deor*. In it he accepts W. W. Lawrence's translation of the refrain, 'old troubles have passed and present ones may', and sees the extant poem as a unit (even as he does both *Wanderer* and *Seafarer*). He argues that if we admit a later Christian interpolation, then we must also admit that the interpolator has done his work perfectly. For details readers are referred to the notes themselves, which are as usual characterized by skilful citation and understanding of Old English syntax.

N. R. Ker's *Two Notes on MS. Ashmole 328 in Med. Æv.* (Feb.) deal with *Byrhtferth's Manual*. The first states that the text of pp. 26–40 of the manuscript is not incomplete (cf.

Crawford's edition) but merely dislocated; the second draws attention to the loss of a leaf after p. 168, a point not noted before and for which the writer gives suitable evidence.

In the December number of *Archiv F. Mezger* writes on *Der germanische Kult und die ae. Feminina auf -icge und -estre*. To put his argument briefly: such derivatives indicate female persons. The question about their origin is diversely answered. Superficially it is obvious, but all the facts have not been made clear. It is to their exact meaning rather than to their detailed philological development that we must go. Woman in her capacity as wise woman or prophetess stands forth: early forms like *dryicge* and *gealdrīcge* produce analogical forms *witicge*. Connected with this group too is the set of derivatives centring round *craeft*, i.e. *craeftiga*, &c. Such words have a double significance, one belonging to a much older period than the other and developing a more superficial significance with the coming of Christianity.

Similar comments are forthcoming on derivatives in *-lac* (cf. Gothic *laiks*, ON. *leikr*) with the original meaning of 'dance, worship', &c. Female activity was especially marked in such a cult and it is to such that we must ultimately go for the explanation of words in *-icge* and *-estre*, not only, moreover, in Old English, but also in Germanic generally. With the arrival of monasticism we find side by side the forms *pingestre* (a female mediator) and *pingere* (a masculine intercessor). The writer also goes into the probable phonetic development of *-str-*.

In the *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, vol. xi, part ii, A. H. Smith follows up work by Grant Loomis, already referred to in *The Year's Work*, xiii. 70-1 and xiv. 99, viz. the connexion between the St. Edmund legend and the story of Ragnar Lothbrok, the viking. Smith's object is to speak of some of Ragnar's sons and more particularly to correlate the various accounts of them in the different records. He deals in some detail with the relationship between the English and Scandinavian records of these persons, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Asser's *Life of Alfred*, Abbo of Fleury's *Life of St. Edmund* on the one hand; and Saxo's *History*, the Saga of Ragnar, the *Thlāttr* of Ragnar's sons, and

the *Krákumál* on the other. By sifting his material he shows that there was a traditional belief in England that the three leaders in 866, Ingware, Ubba, and Halfdane were brothers, sons of the redoubtable Lothbrok. A fourth son, Baerin (i.e. Bjorn of the sagas), said in Scandinavian sources also to have raided England, only occurs as a viking leader in Piramus's *La Vie Seint Edmund le Rey*. Smith is unable to solve the origin of the Old English personage Halfdane, who does not appear in Old Norse records at all. In the section of his article called discrepancies between English and Scandinavian accounts the writer suggests that the Wendover-version of the Lothbrok story, which differs from the Ella-version in the sagas and yet deals with the great invasion of England is merely a 'contaminated' account. This view differs from that expressed by H. G. Leach. Smith would also urge the importance, in the evolution of the English legend, of Ingwar's association with the death of Edmund and not with that of Ella (except in Simeon of Durham).

In *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) F. W. Grube writes on *Meat Foods of the Anglo-Saxons*, collecting an amount of information from such sources as Leechdoms and Laws, Wills and Charters. He describes the domestic animals, domestic fowl, and game birds used by our fathers for food and also gives some account of the method used in cooking them. Many Anglo-Saxon food names are mentioned as being either desirable or undesirable for particular types of digestion (a very modern characteristic), while others are regarded with superstitious fear as primitive man might do.

In *Speculum* (Jan.) under the heading *The Vercelli Book: a New Hypothesis*, by reference to the Laud manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, sub anno 1047, S. J. Herben, Jr., adds what he calls the most plausible hypothesis to the five already existing ones, for explaining why the Vercelli manuscript of Old English writings finds itself in the cathedral library at Vercelli instead of in England. The annal runs: *Ond eft se papa hæfde synod on Vercel. Ond Ulf se biscop com þærto ond forneah man sceolde tobrecan his stef gif he ne seolde be mare gersuman*

forðan he ne cuðe don his gerihte swa wel swa he sceolde. Herben suggests that the above *gersuman* included the Vercelli Codex, a valuable object even in the eleventh century.

Leeds Studies in English, No. 4, contributes one article to this section of *The Year's Work*. A. S. C. Ross writes on *The Nom. Acc. Sg. Fem. and the Anglo-Frisian Hi-Pronoun*. For the forms cited by the writer to illustrate his conclusions about the morphology of this pronoun the reader must be referred to the article itself. They are classified to exemplify the special factors which, in the opinion of the writer, have affected their phonological development, viz. they have been subjected through special conditions of stress to lengthening and accent shift and they tend to be influenced by the paradigm of the definite article.

In *Anglia* (June), dedicated to Karl Luick, Walther Fischer writes on *Wanderer*, v. 25 and v. 6–7. The first passage *sohte sele dreorig sinceb bryttan* the writer would read as *sohte seledreorig* ... taking *seledreorig* as a compound adjective parallel to *wintercearig*, &c., applied to the wanderer himself, 'trauernd um den Saal'. He quotes in support *sele-rædend*, *sele-dream*, &c., and *dreor-sele* in the *Wife's Lament*. In spite of the claimed improvement in syntax, it seems hardly worth while to suppose a problematical compound. It is difficult to see how *seledreorig* could have quite that meaning.

A more attractive suggestion is made for the second passage, to take *hryre* as an accusative with *cwæb*, the wanderer 'told of the fall of his kinsmen'.

With a comment on two other articles in the same number we conclude our survey of a very prolific year in Old English work. *Untersuchungen über die germanischen schwachen Verben III. Klasse (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen)* is the title of H. Flasdieck's contribution. The first part deals with what the writer calls fundamental questions, i.e. the criteria of the original connexion between *ō*- and *ai*- verbs classes and an analysis of certain forms of the *ō*- verbs and of the *ai*- verbs. He then examines verbs found in certain early Old English texts. The rest of this first section deals with verbs belonging to the III

group of weak verbs *habban*, *secg(e)an*, *libban*, &c. The second part considers the verbal forms in the other Germanic dialects, OHG., Old Frisian, Gothic, and the Old Norse dialects. Finally Flasdieck discusses the form and inflexion of these verbs. For details the reader is referred to an article which is most thoroughly and carefully worked out.

In the same number W. Krogmann has written on the etymology of the Old English *tō-sōcnung*.

IV

MIDDLE ENGLISH.

I. CHAUCER, GOWER, AND LYDGATE

By DOROTHY EVERETT

THE year has been one of considerable activity among students of Chaucer and, though there is nothing to record of such outstanding importance as some of the books mentioned in preceding years, there are not a few publications which have, in one way or another, advanced our knowledge and understanding of the poet's works.

The following survey will begin with two articles on Chaucer's attitude towards the use of rhetoric. In *Chaucer and Elocution* (*Medium Ævum*, Oct.) R. C. Goffin contributes some notes on the three items in Chaucer's description of 'heigh style', namely, 'termes of philosophye', 'figures of poetrye', and 'colours of rethoryke' (*Hous of Fame*, 857 ff.). Goffin emphasizes the connexion between Chaucer's frequent apologies for plain speech and the rhetorical doctrine that 'style followed theme, or the character of the personages treated'. He points out that 'Eloquence' is one of the qualities expected of the ideal courtly lover, but while the lover should have command of the 'goodly word' (*Legende of Good Women*, *Prologue*, B 77), he should avoid learned subtleties; uniformity of style is to be aimed at ('Hold of thy matere The forme alwey, and do that it be lyk', *Troilus*, ii. 1039-40). Goffin is convinced that Chaucer himself distrusted the 'heigh style' of the rhetoricians with its use of 'termes of phisyk' (cf. *Troilus*, ii. 1038) and elaborate poetic diction, though this did not prevent his making humorous use of such things.

In an interesting discussion as to whether Chaucer intended any distinction between 'figures of poetrye' and 'colours of rhetoryke', Goffin notes that, as the Middle Ages wore on, 'figures' were more and more associated with metaphor, symbol, and allegory ('the poetic way of imagination in the Middle Ages'), whereas 'colours' usually referred to mere ornament and the term was often used disparagingly. Goffin gives a number of

illustrations of the poetic devices to which Chaucer applies the word 'figure'. Since the 'colours' used by Chaucer, both seriously and satirically, have already received a good deal of attention from scholars, Goffin confines himself to illustrating the one which he thinks demands fuller treatment, the Example from history or classical literature.

B. S. Harrison's article, *The Rhetorical Inconsistency of Chaucer's Franklin* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.), is concerned with Chaucer's use of rhetoric in one portion only of the *Canterbury Tales*. The writer considers how Chaucer meant us to understand the Franklin's apology for his ignorance of rhetoric (*Franklin's Prologue*, F 716 ff.) in view of the fact that his *Tale* is full of rhetorical devices. Such devices are not, indeed, confined to the *Tale*; the Franklin's apology is itself an example of 'a long-established convention' and several of the lines in it witness to his skill in rhetoric. Harrison thinks that there are three possible explanations of this inconsistency. The apology may be merely a meaningless conventional gesture; or, it and the *Tale* may have been written at different times and never properly correlated; or, the poet may be making fun of his readers. Harrison might have found some support for his third explanation in a passage in the *Hous of Fame* where the eagle, like the Franklin, disclaims rhetorical subtleties, though his speech, like the Franklin's, is full of them (cf. F. E. Teager, *Chaucer's Eagle and the Rhetorical Colours*, *P.M.L.A.*, June 1932).

Among the publications concerned with Chaucer's minor works, Carleton Brown's *Chaucer's 'Wreched Engendring'* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) first claims attention since, if his theories be accepted, he has the rare distinction of having added an item to the Chaucer canon. His suggestion is that the poem *An Holy Medytacion*, ascribed by MacCracken to Lydgate and printed by him in the first volume of *Minor Poems of Lydgate*, is in reality the work referred to by Chaucer in the lines,

And of the Wreched Engendryng of Mankynde
As man may in pope Innocent y-fynde.

(*Legende of Good Women*, G Prologue)

Some years ago Brown gave a number of reasons for excluding *An Holy Medytacion* from the Lydgate Canon (cf. *M.L.N.* xl)

and, though he now holds that one of the arguments then adduced is without weight, he still maintains that the poem was not written by Lydgate. In this view he has the support of the well-known editor of Lydgate, Henry Bergen.

Brown showed in his earlier article that the English poem is based directly on a thirteenth-century Latin *Rhythmus* entitled *De Humana Miseria Tractatus*, and he now proves conclusively, by quotation of parallel passages, that this, in its turn, depends upon Pope Innocent's *De Contemptu Mundi*. If it can be assumed that Chaucer was the poet who produced the translation of the *Rhythmus* known as *An Holy Medytacion*, he may well have done so before he knew Pope Innocent's work, but, by the time he wrote the G Prologue to the *Legende of Good Women*, he would certainly have been able to identify this as the direct source of the Latin poem. Brown notes that Chaucer's words in the lines in the G Prologue do not necessarily imply that his work was translated directly from Pope Innocent's.

The evidence produced by Brown for his theory that *An Holy Medytacion* is Chaucer's work is both external and internal. He notes that in one of the two Shirley manuscripts in which it is preserved (MS. Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 3. 20) it 'stands in a group of five pieces of which the first, fourth, and fifth are known to be by Chaucer'. Moreover, in his opinion, if allowance be made for scribal carelessness, 'neither the language nor the metre is inconsistent with this ascription'. Brown gives a long list of rhymes which are paralleled in undoubtedly works of Chaucer and an even more striking list of phrases which are characteristic of him. He justly concludes that if Chaucer is not the author of the poem, it must have been written as a conscious imitation of his work. The latter supposition he dismisses on the ground that 'to carry through a successful imitation of Chaucer's style while translating a Latin treatise "De Humana Miseria" would have been, one may well believe, an impossible *tour de force*'.

It was not to be expected that a theory so startling as this would be accepted without discussion, and it may be noted that it has already been subjected to detailed criticism in *M.L.N.*, May 1936, where Brown's reply to this criticism will also be found. Whether *An Holy Medytacion* be ultimately accepted

as Chaucer's work or not, it should be recognized that Brown's article has shed much light both on the sources and the text of this poem.

In *Chaucer's Debt to Sacrobosco* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.) S. W. Harvey points out that in his *Treatise on the Astrolabe* Chaucer made much more use of the *De Sphaera* of John de Sacrobosco than has previously been thought. Harvey shows that some passages are even translated directly from Sacrobosco's work, though this is not Chaucer's usual way of using it. More often he combines material from the *Compositio et Operatio Astrolabii* of Messahalla with material from Sacrobosco, showing the same methods of selecting and combining material from different sources as those revealed in his poetry.

In *Sir Peter and the 'Envoy to Bukton'* (*P.Q.*, Oct.) Haldeen Braddy calls attention to some information about Sir Peter Bukton in the newly discovered *Kirkstall Chronicles, 1355–1400* (edited by M. V. Clarke and N. Denholme-Young). According to these *Chronicles*, when Richard II, after his deposition, was placed in Knaresborough Castle, he was entrusted to the care of Sir Peter Bukton. This is an added proof of Sir Peter's connexion with the cause of the Lancasters and a further reason for thinking that Chaucer, who also supported this cause, would have come into contact with him. It, therefore, in Braddy's opinion, strengthens the possibility that he was the 'meister Bukton' of the *Envoy*.

Of the two publications concerned with the *Hous of Fame*, the shorter, *Precious Stones in 'The House of Fame'* (*M.L.N.*, May) by Howard R. Patch, consists of notes on the significance of the stones mentioned in this poem. Patch emphasizes a suggestion made earlier by Sypherd, that Chaucer had a special reason for describing Fame's House as made of 'ston of beryl' (ll. 1183–7). The beryl was supposed to foster love and to cause the man or woman who wore it to be 'muche worshipped'. In Chaucer's poem it had, therefore, a 'twofold appropriateness' and Chaucer himself adds yet another when he tells us (ll. 1288–91) that the walls of beryl 'made wel more than hit was To semen, everythyng, y-wis'.

The ruby, of which Fame's 'see imperiall' was composed (cf. *Hous of Fame*, 1361-3), is also appropriate in its context, for it wins 'honeur and grace' for him who has it and also, judging from Chaucer's references to it elsewhere, it sometimes symbolizes love.

The other publication, Bertrand H. Bronson's paper *Chaucer's Hous of Fame: Another Hypothesis*,¹ should have been noticed last year. Reviewing earlier attempts at the interpretation of the poem, Bronson first dismisses 'all theories which seek to impose upon the poem an elaborate allegorical interpretation', and then considers Sypherd's work on it. He agrees that Sypherd has demonstrated its relation to the *genre* of the Old French *love vision* but insists that the 'value and significance of the poem lie in its departures from the type' rather than in its conformity with it. There are no grounds, he thinks, for the view that the poem was meant to be the prologue to a love-tale or love-tales; it is, on the contrary, 'nearly complete as it stands', lacking only its conclusion, which would have been its climax. This conclusion was to contain 'newe tydinges', to be uttered by the 'man of gret auctorite' (see the last line of the poem); that is, according to Bronson, it was to tell not of some legendary love-story but of some contemporary event. But Bronson does not believe with Brusendorff that the tidings would have been about the forthcoming marriage of Richard II and Anne of Bohemia. Lines 2134-8 may be an allusion to this marriage, but if so, these lines can only mean that Chaucer is not going to speak of it in this poem.

Searching the poem itself for clues as to the nature of the tidings, Bronson suggests that Chaucer may intentionally have made a distinction (in ll. 644-51) between tidings 'fro fer con-tree' and those of his 'verray neyghbores', and, since in ll. 2134-8 he has definitely set aside the former, he probably meant the 'man of great authority' to speak of the love affairs of some acquaintance in high position. Further, Bronson thinks that it would fit in with the tone of the poem as a whole if the tidings were 'of dubious credit to the person celebrated: some gossip perhaps of a great man's infidelity in love'. If this were so, and

¹ *Chaucer's Hous of Fame: Another Hypothesis*, by Bertrand H. Bronson. California Univ. Press and C.U.P. 1934. 1s. 3d.

Chaucer by the conclusion and climax of his poem had given offence to some important person, it might explain why this conclusion has not survived; for, as Bronson remarks, there is 'something . . . highly suspicious about the poem's breaking off just at the crucial point of the narrative. It has the air not of chance but of deliberate intent.' Bronson refrains from proposing 'a candidate for the unfilled niche in the *Hous of Fame*', and aims merely at indicating the direction in which the final solution will be found.

The same writer has this year published an interesting essay on the *Parlement of Foules*.² He believes that Chaucer's *love visions* have been undervalued by many critics and he begins by stressing their individuality. There follows a statement with which not all critics and lovers of Chaucer will agree, even though they may appreciate many of the points which are made to depend upon it. 'It is clear enough', says Bronson, speaking of the cult of courtly love and of the *love vision* type of poem, 'that the subject and the *genre* were radically uncongenial to his [Chaucer's] temperament', and he suggests that Chaucer's 'recurrent disclaimer' of personal knowledge of love is not merely a joke. He is on firmer ground when he proceeds to emphasize the ironic tone of the *Parlement*, speaking of it as 'the medium in which the poem exists—its unifying principle'.

The analysis of the poem which Bronson undertakes in order to reveal the quality of its pervading irony contains some acute observations and is in essentials faithful to the spirit and letter of the original. Of real value is his recognition of the significance of the poet's account of the *Somnium Scipionis* (see especially ll. 50–70). This passage, he observes, calls to mind the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, but while that poem can bear the 'full weight' of the contrast between earthly 'felicite' and heavenly, the *Parlement* could not, and so here the poet set down the solemn matter of the *Somnium* side by side with the dream, without comment. The effect is to impart 'a flavor of irony to the fantasy of the vision'. The incongruous role played by Africanus in the dream continues the ironic note and so too, in

² *In Appreciation of Chaucer's Parlement of Foules*, by Bertrand H. Bronson. California Univ. Press and C.U.P. 1s. 6d.

Bronson's opinion, does the stanza addressed to Cytherea. In connexion with this stanza Bronson discusses at some length the meaning of the phrase 'north-north-west'. His suggestion is that it has something of the same force as when Hamlet used it (cf. 'I am but mad north-north-west' = 'hardly at all'). Chaucer means that when he began to write he hardly saw Venus at all, or, in other words, that the beginning of the *Parlement* was 'far from being conceived under the inspiration of the goddess of love'.

Passing to the birds' debate, Bronson rejects the view that it is an example of the conventional *demande d'amour* and shows that it differs in several important respects from works of this type. Nor, in his opinion, is its meaning to be sought in any historical situation. 'The birds . . . are types of humanity' and not individuals; they represent the contrasting attitudes towards love of the 'idealist' and 'realist', and in the course of their debate Chaucer directs his irony against both.

Finally, Bronson briefly considers the relation of the poem to the typical *love vision*. While it contains almost all the stock conventions of this genre, most of them are so 'transmogrified' that the poem is, as he says, 'the most highly individualized of all Chaucer's *love visions*' except the *Hous of Fame*. This exception leads to the question whether the *Hous of Fame* should not be regarded as the later work of the two, but the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, which is indubitably the last of the *love visions* and yet is faithful to the convention, would appear to be an argument against this.

A letter by Haldeen Braddy on *The Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules* (*R.E.S.*, April) was mentioned last year in connexion with the article by John Matthews Manly (*R.E.S.*, July 1934) to which it is an answer (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 89–90).

R. C. Goffin has produced an edition of selected portions of *Troilus and Criseyde*³ for the use of schools and colleges. While recognizing that the poem suffers from 'any kind of abridgement', he considers that 'practical reasons' justify his experi-

³ Chaucer: *Troilus and Criseyde*, abridged and ed. by R. C. Goffin. O.U.P. pp. xxxiv + 131. 3s.

ment and he hopes that some understanding of the 'greatness of Chaucer's one finished masterpiece' may be gained from his edition. Goffin's abridged version does succeed in presenting the story as a coherent whole, but inevitably it has to omit much that lovers of the poem will regret.

To some extent Goffin makes up for his omissions in the Introduction and Notes. The Introduction concerns itself with some of the 'contemporary conventions and inherited traditions' which it is necessary to understand if the poem is to be properly appreciated; some account is given, for instance, of the tradition of courtly love, of the medieval conception of 'tragedy', and of Chaucer's interest in and use of rhetoric. It may be questioned, however, whether the treatment of these matters is always elementary enough for the beginner in medieval literature; the editor tends sometimes to substitute for simple exposition a discussion of those aspects of them that particularly interest him.

In *The Date of the 'Troilus' and Minor Chauceriana* (*M.L.N.*, May) J. S. P. Tatlock reviews the evidence adduced by various scholars for the date of *Troilus and Criseyde*. He disagrees with Lowe's suggestion that the line 'Right as oure firste lettre is now an A' (i. 171) is a reference to Queen Anne and that it serves to date the poem after January 1382 when Richard and Anne were married. Nor does he accept Root's view that the conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn, and the crescent Moon described in iii. 624-5 must indicate that the poem was 'not finished earlier than the Spring of 1385' (Root), when this unusual conjunction actually took place. Since such a phenomenon would certainly have been foreseen by astrologers long before it occurred, Tatlock maintains that reference could have been made to it several years earlier.

While not arguing for any particular date, Tatlock is doubtful about a late one. He thinks that *Troilus* was certainly written before the 'Love of Palamon and Arcite' (*The Knight's Tale*). In support of this relative chronology he draws attention to the references to Dane (Daphne) in the two poems. In *Troilus*, iii. 726 Chaucer mentions Dane, but many of the earliest manuscripts produce the name as 'Diane'. The poet was 'evidently annoyed by this error' and in the reference in the *Knight's*

Tale (A 2063-4) he breaks out, 'I mene nat the goddesse Diane, But Penneus doughter which that highte Dane'. In support of a fairly early date for the composition of the original draft of *Troilus*, Tatlock notes that a considerable period of time must be allowed for the revisions of the poem.

Charles Child Walcutt has made a study of Chaucer's use of the plural and singular forms of the pronoun of address in *Troilus* (*The Pronoun of Address in 'Troilus and Criseyde'*, P.Q., July). The fact that Troilus and Criseyde almost always address one another with the plural pronoun is a sign, he thinks, of the extent to which Chaucer followed the court of love conventions in this poem, especially since, in *Il Filostrato*, the lovers use the familiar form of address. Walcutt also comments on the method of address used by other characters. Pandarus at first addresses Troilus as 'yow', but afterwards as 'thee', 'thou' except when he is being specially serious; Criseyde he usually addresses as 'yow', but in moments of excitement he drops into the singular pronoun. An interesting fact is that, while Pandarus, as one would expect, uses the polite pronoun to Helen and Deiphebus, Deiphebus addresses him as 'thee', 'thou'. This evidence that Deiphebus does not consider Pandarus as an equal helps to throw light on Chaucer's conception of the character.

In a letter headed with the (? unintentional) misquotation '*Lollius myn Autour*' (T.L.S., Dec. 28) Catharine Carswell suggests an explanation of Chaucer's references to Lollius which, though not impossible, involves several unprovable hypotheses. She suggests that Lollius may have been the nickname given to Boccaccio by Petrarch, who had a habit of giving classical nicknames to members of the literary circle to which he belonged. Further, she supposes that Chaucer may have met Boccaccio and asked permission to use his writings, and that Boccaccio, now grown old and repentant for some of his earlier follies, gave him leave, provided he did not mention his name. In using the nickname Lollius, Chaucer would have fulfilled Boccaccio's condition, in the letter at least, and at the same time satisfied his own desire to give him his due.

The difficult task of rendering the *Canterbury Tales* in 'modern dress' has been twice undertaken recently. Frank Ernest Hill's

rendering first appeared in 1934 and has been republished in a cheaper edition in 1936;⁴ J. U. Nicolson's appeared in 1935, with a short introduction by Gordon Hall Gerould.⁵ Both translators have followed Chaucer's metrical schemes, using the heroic couplet where he does and even using his tail-rhyme stanza in *Sir Thopas*. In the introduction to the second of these translations Gerould claims that Nicolson's version has the 'merit of faithfulness' and that he has 'added less and subtracted less than most of his predecessors', but Hill's version also keeps remarkably close to Chaucer, sometimes even closer than Nicolson's. The two renderings of the familiar first four lines of the *Prologue* will illustrate this. Nicolson's runs,

When April with his showers sweet with fruit
The drought of March has pierced unto the root
And bathed each vein with liquor that has power
To generate therein and sire the flower . . .

while Hill, sacrificing the rhyme in the first couplet, writes,

When April with his showers hath pierced the drought
Of March with sweetness to the very root,
And flooded every vein with liquid power
That of its strength engendereth the flower; . . .

It is of course a question whether a very close rendering really does most justice to Chaucer and whether, if modernizations are needed, they should not be real ones, attempting to convey to the modern reader as much as possible of the spirit of Chaucer, which he can appreciate, rather than the letter, which he may not understand. The reader who can grasp the full meaning of the line, 'So pleasant was his *In principio*' (preserved unaltered except for spelling by both translators) or of the couplet, 'He knew the cause of every malady, Were it of hot or cold, of moist or dry' (Nicolson; Hill's 'Were it from Hot or Cold or Moist or Dry' does not make it any easier) could surely be trusted to understand what Chaucer himself wrote.

⁴ *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer, rendered into modern English verse by Frank Ernest Hill. 2 vols. Limited Editions Club. xxii+330, 331-670. Also published in 1 vol. Allen and Unwin, 1936. pp. 583. 10s. 6d.

⁵ *Geoffrey Chaucer: Canterbury Tales*, rendered into Modern English by J. U. Nicolson. Harrap. pp. xviii+627. 12s. 6d.

Two editions of parts of the *Canterbury Tales* have appeared this year, Carleton Brown's edition of the *Pardoner's Tale*, which will be considered together with other work on that *Tale*, and Gordon Hall Gerould's edition of *The Prologue and Four Canterbury Tales*⁶ (i.e. the *Tales* of the Nun's Priest, the Pardoner, the Franklin, and the Second Nun). For the last of these Gerould puts in a special plea, remarking that it has 'seldom received its due meed of praise'. He claims that in it Chaucer turned 'mediocre prose to poetry of singular sweetness' and he comments on its 'hymn-like melody'. At the end of the selection of *Tales* Gerould reprints a number of Middle English lyrics, including some of Chaucer's. The texts are preceded by a brief but well conceived introduction dealing with Chaucer's life and works. The critical apparatus that accompanies them is probably sufficient for the general reader but would hardly meet the needs of the serious student.

The purpose of J. S. P. Tatlock's long and important article *The 'Canterbury Tales' in 1400* (*P.M.L.A.*, Mar.) is to consider systematically the various possibilities about the condition of the *Tales* shortly before and after Chaucer's death and to present, even if tentatively, a clear-cut view of the history of the work.

Tatlock accepts the surmise that Chaucer wrote on loose sheets of vellum or paper but he does not think there is anything to indicate whether these were entirely separate or were in quires, as Miss Hammond and Brusendorff thought. Nor does he find any evidence to show whether the order of the items in a group (i.e. in a group such as A, the contents of which are certain) was determined by some such means as sewing or tying, or was merely indicated by notation on the items themselves or on a memorandum, or whether it was not indicated at all but is due to the intelligence of the scribes or 'editors'.

Tatlock finds some evidence, but not a great deal, that Chaucer made revisions in his own manuscript, but there is, as he says, far more evidence of lack of revision. He agrees with those scholars who have held that Chaucer was not responsible for

⁶ *The Prologue and Four Canterbury Tales*, ed. by Gordon Hall Gerould. New York: Nelson. pp. 138.

the 'titles, headings and endings of the parts' but thinks, with Brusendorff, that the 'marginal Latin extracts from sources' are due to him, as also the Latin glosses found above difficult words. If this is so, it seems likely that the extant manuscripts derive, not from a 'fair copy', but directly from Chaucer's original manuscript. Tatlock believes that the evidence points against 'publication' or unlimited circulation of the whole work during Chaucer's life-time.

When, after Chaucer's death, his own 'informal draft' of the *Tales*, still on separate sheets or quires, came into the hands of the professional scribe or bookseller, among the chief difficulties to be faced were the gaps and breaks in continuity. Since these might lead a reader to suspect that his copy was damaged or incomplete, various expedients were adopted to allay this suspicion or prevent its arising. For instance, rubrics, headings, and titles were inserted to conceal gaps, and incomplete items were sometimes omitted. In Tatlock's opinion 'A large part of the changes and adjustments in the MSS. were for the contentment and convenience of readers'; and on this opinion his interpretation of the present state of the manuscripts largely depends. In this section of his article he discusses fully the problem of the 'Man of Law's End-Link' and arrives at conclusions which, in the main, agree with those of Tupper set forth in his article last year (cf. *The Year's Work*, xv. 92-4).

Tatlock approaches the thorny problem of the arrangement of the *Tales* by first enumerating and examining the four kinds of evidence on the arrangement which he thinks reliable, namely, 'joining by links, clear allusions to earlier incidents of the pilgrimage, notes of place, notes of time'. He decides that this evidence points to the order A B¹ B² C D E-F G H-I, the order adopted by Furnivall and Skeat. If, however, this is the order intended by Chaucer, why is it not found in any one of the manuscripts? In his answer to this question, Tatlock insists that if Chaucer left his manuscript in the state previously suggested, there is no reason why the arrangements in the manuscripts should have any authority, unless Chaucer left notes about the order. If he did, 'probably all would agree that the order could be only that of MS. Ellesmere and a few later congeners', but there are various reasons for regarding this as

unauthoritative, one being the condition of its 'nearest relative', Hengwrt. This manuscript is claimed by Tatlock as the work of the same scribe as Ellesmere, but it was written earlier than Ellesmere. Its arrangement is 'one of the very worst' of all the manuscript arrangements. In a long and detailed 'Note on the Hengwrt MS.' appended to his article Tatlock explains his reasons for thinking that the scribe of Hengwrt copied from loose sheets and was obliged to evolve his own arrangement. When he came to write his later copy, Ellesmere, 'he took more care or better guidance, and got a more satisfactory order', but Tatlock's examination of this order suggests that there is a principle behind it which could hardly have been the author's.

Finally, Tatlock asks whether there is anything to suggest that some of the oft-recurring sequences of groups may be due to Chaucer and replies that 'evidence for arrangement of the "groups" indicated externally by Chaucer does not exist'.

Some of Tatlock's conclusions were, of course, anticipated by Tupper's article of last year, but Tatlock's examination of the problems presented by the manuscripts of the *Tales* covers a great deal more ground.

In *Corrections in the Paris Manuscript of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'* (*Texas Studies in English*, 15) Martin Michael Crow records the results of his examination of the corrections in MS. fonds anglais 39 (Ps.) in the Bibliothèque Nationale. He notes that these corrections are in two hands, the first that of the professional scribe of the manuscript, who signs himself at the end 'Duxworth Scriptor', the second that of Jean, conte d'Angoulême, who owned the manuscript. Crow's careful examination of the differences in the handwritings of these two men has enabled him to determine in most cases for which of the 420 corrections in the manuscript each was responsible and, therefore, to discover the 'habits and purposes of each corrector'.

Duxworth's corrections, which are always inconspicuous, appear to have been made in order to bring the text into conformity with that of the manuscript by which he corrected. This manuscript was apparently a good one, much better than his exemplar, for his corrections almost always give a correct reading. Since in B² and G, however, there are several corrections

'erroneous at least in part and showing agreement in error with large groups of manuscripts', Crow suggests that from the beginning of B² Duxworth must have used a second manuscript for his corrections. The nature of most of his corrections show him to have been on the whole a careful scribe anxious to produce a correct text; very few of his alterations are 'editorial' attempts to improve the text.

Angoulême's corrections differ from Duxworth's in appearance and purpose. Angoulême made no attempt to conceal them and his aim in introducing them was 'to secure a readable text' both by clarifying the sense and improving the metre. Some of his corrections were made from another (and a good) manuscript, but some were evidently not, 'for often where he detects omissions he inserts unique readings' instead of the correct readings. Crow gives a number of examples of such unique readings; he also gives examples of Angoulême's peculiar spellings, some of which are Northern in character while others, according to Crow, are 'phonetic spellings influenced by French'.

In his article on *The Marriage Debate in the 'Canterbury Tales'* (E.L.H., Nov.) Clifford P. Lyons quotes and discusses Kittredge's statement of the theory that a part of the *Canterbury Tales* is to be regarded as a debate on the subject of marriage. Lyons agrees that the tales of the Wife of Bath, the Clerk, the Merchant, and the Franklin do illustrate 'conflicting ideas about conjugal sovereignty', but finds no confirmation of the view that 'the ideas on marriage in the tales are dramatized as a debate among the Pilgrims'. He argues that, if Chaucer had intended these tales to be contributions to a discussion on marriage, he would have made it clear in the comments on them. Actually, as Lyons points out, there is no mention whatever of the subject of marriage in the comments on the *Wife's Prologue* and *Tale*.

Kittredge, regarding the Clerk's *Envoy* as an attack on the Wife of Bath, stressed its dramatic significance as part of the debate and as perfectly suited to the Clerk, but Lyons denies that it is an attack on the Wife; in his view it is merely a 'jovially ironical song . . . in her honour'. Nor does he consider

the *Merchant's Tale* an attack upon her. Though the unfortunate experiences in marriage of both the Merchant and the Host might have made them opponents of the Wife, there is nothing either in the *Merchant's Tale* or in the Host's comment on it to indicate that they regard themselves as such. Finally, there is no suggestion that the *Franklin's Tale*, which, according to Kittredge, offers the solution of the problem of sovereignty in marriage, was intended to be connected in subject with the other tales. Chaucer seems to have thought of it as presenting a 'problem in gentilnesse' (cf. F 1622, 'Which was the mooste fre, as thynketh yow?')

The publications which follow next are each concerned with a single item in the *Canterbury Tales*. They will be taken in the order of the *Tales* as found in Skeat's edition.

Among the notes on the *Prologue* there are two dealing with the Friar. In *A Note on Chaucer's Friar* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) Karl Young considers the meaning of A 212–13, 'He hadde maad ful many a mariage Of yonge wommen at his owene cost'. The most generally accepted interpretation, that the Friar provided for the marriage of young women whom he had seduced, seems to Young 'unescapable', and he is able to produce a new piece of historical evidence showing that such a proceeding was not unknown in Chaucer's day. In an unpublished memorandum of the year 1321 from the register of John de Drokensford, Bishop of Bath and Wells, a certain vicar named Geoffrey was 'charged with having broken his promise to provide funds toward a suitable marriage for a certain Juliana, by whom he had had 2 children'.

In the contribution to *M.L.N.* (May) entitled *The Date of the 'Troilus' and Minor Chauceriana*, J. S. P. Tatlock includes a note on the order to which the Friar belonged. He is apparently not of the same order as the Friar of the *Summoner's Tale* who was probably a Carmelite, since the Carmelites claimed Elijah as their founder (cf. D, ll. 2116–17). Lines 242–7 in the *Prologue* would have special point if he were a Franciscan, but Chaucer's portrait is by no means unmistakably that of a Franciscan and, on the whole, it is more likely that it is 'a composite picture'.

Albert Eichler in *Zu Chaucer, 'Canterbury Tales, General Prologue'*, l. 207 (*Eng. Stud.*, April) discusses the phrase 'broun as a berye', still, of course, in use. He asks to what berry the epithet 'brown' would be appropriate and suggests the haw, at some stages of its ripening. He notes, however, that English popular speech is lax in its use of the colour words 'brown' and 'red' (cf. a red cow).

In her note '*Falding*' and '*Medlee*' (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.) M. Channing Linthicum comments on the variety of woollen stuffs in use in Chaucer's day, as evidenced by the dress of the pilgrims. She explains the nature of '*falding*' (A 391) and of '*medlee*' (A 328), worn by the Shipman and the Sergeant of the Law respectively.

An article entitled *The So-called Prologue to the 'Knight's Tale'* (*M.L.N.*, May) by Willis J. Wager aims at proving by detailed analysis that the second paragraph of the *Knight's Tale* (A 875-92) was added by Chaucer at the time when he incorporated the already existing story of Palamon and Arcite in the *Canterbury Tales*. Wager suggests that ll. 889-92, which refer to the pilgrims, mark the end of the inserted passage, while the shift of tenses between ll. 873-6 ('Lete I . . .' l. 873, beside 'I wolde haue toold yow . . .' l. 876) indicates where this passage begins. He notes that the eighteen lines which he believes to have been inserted can be removed altogether without disturbing the narrative. The first of them 'recount in orderly succession' incidents mentioned in the *Knight's Tale* immediately before the passage. Line 884 ('And of the tempest at hir hoom-comynge'), which has been taken as a reference to the storm at sea on the occasion of the arrival of Queen Anne in England in the year 1381, Wager interprets rather as a reference both to the applause which greeted Theseus and Hippolyta on their arrival in Greece and to the outcry of the Theban ladies whose plight is described just after the 'inserted passage'. Hence, in his opinion, no new fact is mentioned in these lines.

While there is, clearly, something to be said for the view (first suggested by Tatlock) that these eighteen lines are a later insertion into an earlier narrative, it is difficult to accept Wager's interpretation of the word 'tempest' on which his last point depends.

George R. Coffman's *Note on the Miller's Prologue* (*M.L.N.*, May) suggests that in A 3141 ('For I wol telle a *legende and a lyf* . . .') the Miller, who has already declared that he will meet the Knight on his own ground (cf. A 3126-7), now turns to challenge the Monk, whose place as story-teller he has taken (cf. A 3118 ff.). Coffman points out that when, later on, the Monk is once more invited to tell a tale, he makes a remark which seems to be connected with the Miller's (cf. B 3160).

In *Another Analogue to 'The Prioresses Tale'* (*M.L.N.*, May) Woodburn O. Ross draws attention to a hitherto unnoticed analogue to the *Prioress's Tale* to be found in the *Summa Praedicantium* of John Bromyard. He observes that this version of the story of the boy murdered by Jews does not fit into any of the three main classes into which Carleton Brown divided the versions known to him, for it combines characteristic features from each. This leads him to emphasize the 'tentative nature of Professor Brown's conclusions'. Further search in collections of religious stories and in sermon manuscripts may result in showing that the twenty-seven versions investigated by Brown do not 'represent adequately the development of the story'.

Roused by the statement in Robinson's edition of Chaucer's *Works* that 'two recent studies of *Sir Thopas* have made it seem very probable that Chaucer had another purpose [than the burlesquing of the metrical romances], perhaps his primary one, namely, to poke fun at the Flemish knighthood', William W. Lawrence proceeds to attack this interpretation of the 'Rime' in an article entitled *Satire in 'Sir Thopas'* (*P.M.L.A.*, Mar.). He first considers Miss Lilian Winstanley's theory that *Sir Thopas* was intended as a satire against Philip van Artevelde and points out that the poem contains no reference, 'open or concealed', to Philip, and that this theory implies that Chaucer inserted into the *Tales* 'satire of a man long since dead'. He then turns to Manly's more plausible hypothesis. Manly stated that 'Chaucer's primary object was . . . to produce a satire of the countrymen of *Sir Thopas*', but Lawrence notes that the only definite evidence in favour of this is the fact that Sir

Thopas is said to have been born in Flanders. 'Is it not dangerous', he asks, 'to make the whole interpretation of the piece turn on this?' Lawrence dissents from Manly's view that such a satire 'would have been highly appropriate, during the visit of the Flemish embassy [in 1383] . . . or immediately after it'. He maintains that the Flemish embassy was treated with politeness and cordiality while in London and that there is little ground for thinking that it 'would have seemed so ridiculous that Chaucer was moved to create Sir Thopas'. Further, there is no evidence that *Sir Thopas* was written as early as 1383 or immediately after; it is much more likely that it was 'planned for the dramatic situation in which it is so effectively introduced' (Robinson). If it had been written in 1383–4 as a satire on the Flemish embassy, it would have been stale by the time it was incorporated in the *Canterbury Tales*.

The extravagant view of Chaucer's aims in *Sir Thopas* which C. Camden, Jr., expresses in his note *The Physiognomy of Thopas* (*R.E.S.*, July) shows that it was high time for a careful and reasonable discussion of the problem such as Lawrence's. Camden writes, 'It seems altogether likely . . . that Chaucer's intention was to write a rollicking tale which would be a sustained burlesque on everything imaginable, from pompous Flemings to literary conventions'. The immediate purpose of this note is to show that, in describing Sir Thopas, Chaucer made use of physical characteristics which would have been recognized in the fourteenth century as indicating a timid and cowardly man. His 'sydes smale', according to Metham's *Physiognomy*, signified 'ferffulness'; his white face ('whit . . . as payndemayn') and his 'lippes rede as rose' were more suited to a woman than a man and, in a man, a white complexion indicated timidity or effeminacy. Camden suggests that in such details as these Chaucer was burlesquing the typical knightly hero.

In a note entitled *Chaucer's 'Jewes Werk' and 'Guy of Warwick'*, (*P.Q.*, Oct.) Laura Hibbard Loomis claims that Sir Thopas's 'fyn hawberk, Was al y-wroght of Jewes werk' was suggested by a passage in the stanzaic *Guy of Warwick* (Auchinleck MS.), a poem which has many verbal echoes in *Sir Thopas*. In stanza 91 of this poem we read 'be hauberk he hadde was renis'. This is Zupitza's reading, but the correct reading may be *reuis*. Mrs.

Loomis thinks that the word *renis/reuis* is a scribal error for *ieuvis*, i.e. *iewes* (Jew's). If, as she believes, Chaucer knew the Auchinleck MS. itself, it would not be impossible for him to guess that *ieuvis* was what the author had intended.

Students of Chaucer will be interested in Mrs. Loomis's suggestion that Chaucer knew the Auchinleck MS. and will look forward to her promised article on this point.

J. Burke Severs has made an important contribution to *P.M.L.A.* (Mar.) entitled *The Source of Chaucer's 'Melibeus'*. He has located twenty-six manuscripts of the Old French *Mélibée* which Chaucer used and has examined all but three of these. As a result, he is able to show that the text in *Le Ménagier de Paris*, which is usually quoted by scholars in discussing the source of *Melibeus*, is unsatisfactory for that purpose. To prove this Severs quotes a number of passages as they appear in the original Latin, in *Le Ménagier*, in one of the manuscripts he has examined (MS. fr. 1165 in the Bibliothèque Nationale) and in Chaucer's *Melibeus*. Though the variations in the two French versions are often slight it is always with MS. fr. 1165 rather than with *Le Ménagier* that Chaucer agrees in these passages. Other facts can also be deduced from the comparison. Some of the passages indicate that Chaucer was using a corrupt copy of the *Mélibée*, for he has errors (also found in MS. fr. 1165) which were not due to mistranslation and could only have originated in 'French miscopyings' from the original French translation. His retention of these errors makes it unlikely that Chaucer had access to a text of the Latin version, as has been maintained by some scholars. Severs is able to show that use of *Le Ménagier* has led to false conclusions about this matter. Some passages to which Grace W. Landrum referred (*P.M.L.A.*, xxxix) in order to prove that Chaucer did use the Latin, are certainly lacking in *Le Ménagier*, but they are to be found in MS. fr. 1165 and were therefore, presumably, in Chaucer's source. Comparison with MS. fr. 1165 shows, too, that Chaucer did not alter his source in order to fit his material for political propaganda, as J. Leslie Hotson thought (cf. *S. in Ph.*, xviii). This fact destroys much of the evidence for Hotson's theory that 'the *Melibeus* is a political tract, designed to

dissuade John of Gaunt from launching on the invasion of Castile in 1386'.

It is important to notice that Severs does not claim that MS. fr. 1165 is Chaucer's source or even that it gives a satisfactory text of it. Indeed, he notes that in many places *Le Ménagier* is obviously closer to the version used by Chaucer than this manuscript is. Severs states that neither separately 'affords a satisfactory text. . . . Together, however, they come close to supplying such a text' and he suggests that any deficiencies that remain can probably be supplied from among the remaining twenty-five manuscripts.

The date of the composition of the *Monk's Tale* is discussed by Haldeen Braddy in *The Two Petros in the 'Monkes Tale'* (*P.M.L.A.*, Mar.). A 'complicating factor' in the determination of it is, as he remarks, the presence of the 'Modern Instances'. As far as the stanza on Bernabo is concerned, Braddy is apparently ready to accept the suggestion that it was composed later than the other tragedies, for he agrees with Kittredge that it bears signs of being an 'afterthought'; but his examination of the other three Modern Instances leads him to believe that they were written as part of the series.

He first discusses the true position of the Modern Instances, taking into consideration the manuscript variations in the *Nun's Priest's Prologue*, which, in his opinion, have some bearing on the problem. In ten manuscripts an important passage in this Prologue (B² 3961-80) is lacking. It is significant that the absence of this passage does not result in any lack of coherence in the Prologue, but it does result in the disappearance of the line 'He spak how Fortune covered with a clowde' (B² 3972), which is a direct reference to the last line of the tragedy of Croesus. This, remarks Braddy, 'proves conclusively that when this passage was written the Modern Instances did not stand at the end' of the series. He believes that the manuscripts indicate three stages in the arrangement of this material; in the first the Modern Instances were in the middle and were followed by the shorter form of the 'Nun's Priest's Prologue'; in the second, the Modern Instances were in the same position but were followed by the expanded Prologue—'a stage also no

doubt attributable to Chaucer'; in the third, the Modern Instances were at the end, 'probably as the result of scribal arrangement', and were followed by the expanded Prologue.

If this view be accepted it follows, of course, that the Modern Instances were written as part of the series of tragedies and that 'the chronology of this group carries with it, therefore, the date of the tale as a whole'. (Braddy is, of course, excepting the Bernabo stanza from the statement, though he does not say so.) This makes the stories of the two 'Petros' of special significance, for both these men died in 1369 and Chaucer would most probably have written his accounts of them not long after their deaths. Moreover, Braddy thinks that the materials on which Chaucer drew indicate an early date of composition. His account of the tragedy of Pedro of Spain differs from that of Froissart and agrees with that of Ayala of Spain, which appears to be the true one. It is hardly possible, however, that Chaucer should have read Ayala's chronicle, and Braddy suggests that he obtained his information through his friend, Sir Guichard d'Angle, who was fighting in the Spanish campaign at the time of Pedro's death.

Chaucer's account of 'Petro' of Cyprus is traced by Braddy to Machault's *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, written about the year 1369. He points out that both accounts are historically inaccurate and contain some of the same mistakes.

Braddy's evidence for the date of the Modern Instances (and hence, according to his view, of the whole series of tragedies) is then as follows: Chaucer could have obtained his information about the two 'Petros' shortly after their deaths in 1369; in the case of Pedro of Spain, he must, if Sir Guichard was his informant, have obtained it before 1380, the year of Sir Guichard's death. The Ugolino stanzas, which are dependent on Dante, may well have been written about 1374, just after Chaucer's introduction to Italian literature. This suggests the date 1373-4 for the composition of the *Monk's Tale* as a whole.

It is unfortunate that this ingenious argument has to depend on a number of hypotheses, for, since the rejection of any one of them would destroy it, it can hardly be regarded as finally settling the problem of the date.

In *Vincent of Beauvais and Dame Pertelote's Knowledge of Medicine* (*Speculum*, July) Pauline Aiken shows that the *Nun's Priest's Tale* bears several signs that Chaucer knew and used Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Naturale* and *Speculum Doctrinale*. Especially, Pertelote's knowledge of medicine seems to be derived from Vincent. Her general opinion of dreams (B 4112 ff.), her 'more specific remarks' on dreams caused by 'rede colera' or by melancholy, and the remedies she suggests (B 4151 ff.) all appear in his works. Several times her words verbally echo passages in Vincent and once her exact sequence of ideas can be found there. Other, non-medical, passages in the *Tale* which are probably to be traced to him are Chanticleere's account of Andromache's dream, the lines on the sirens (B 4460–2), and possibly Chanticleere's Latin line 'Mulier est hominis confusio'.

In a concluding paragraph Miss Aiken notes that 'every detail of medical theory and practice not only in the *Nun's Priest's Tale* but in the whole body of Chaucer's works' can be found in Vincent of Beauvais, and an examination of the chief medical works known in Chaucer's day has shown that this is not true of any one of them.

A note by B[ruce] D[ickins] entitled 'Seynd Bacoun' (*Leeds Studies in English*, No. 4) suggests that the 'seynd bacoun' on which the poor widow of the *Nun's Priest's Tale* lived (cf. B 4035) was not 'singed', 'broiled', or 'smoked' bacon but fat bacon. Dickins would derive 'seynd' from O.F. *saim*, *sain*, preserved in Modern Standard French *saindoux*, 'lard'.

Carleton Brown's edition of *The Pardoner's Tale*⁷ for the use of schools and colleges has an interesting and suggestive introduction. The editor begins by showing how close Chaucer kept to contemporary fact in his description of the Pardoner. It is this 'close agreement between Chaucer's description and the general reputation of pardoners in the fourteenth century' that makes him sceptical of Manly's theory that the portrait of the Pardoner depicts an actual person.

Brown does not agree with those scholars who have thought

⁷ *The Pardoner's Tale*, ed. by Carleton Brown. O.U.P. pp. xl+63.
2s. 6d.

that the Pardoner's *Prologue* and *Tale* were intended to be taken together as an example of the medieval sermon, partly because 'the flippancy and cynicism of the Prologue stand', he thinks, 'in the sharpest contrast to the seriousness which characterizes the Tale'. Moreover, the Pardoner himself never refers to his discourse as a sermon but speaks of telling a 'moral tale . . . which I am wont to preche', and this, says Brown, 'defines it precisely as an *exemplum*', a mere section of a sermon.

Commenting on the lack of connexion between the 'Homily on the Sins of the Tavern' in the earlier part of the *Tale* (ll. 135–332) and the *Prologue* and the tale proper, Brown accepts Hinckley's suggestion that the Homily 'was originally intended for the Parson rather than for the Pardoner' (Hinckley). The opening passage of this Homily, as Miss Petersen showed, resembles in several points the openings of two *exempla* in Thomas of Cantimpré's *Liber de Apibus*, but in neither case is the story that follows the same as that told by the Pardoner. Brown suggests that the Homily may originally have been followed by the story of the bleeding stranger found in the first of the two relevant *exempla* in Thomas of Cantimpré's collection and that Chaucer substituted for it the present Pardonner's tale at the time when he transferred the 'Homily on the Sins of the Tavern' from the Parson to the Pardoner. Brown recognizes, of course, that this theory of the evolution of the Pardonner's Tale is pure hypothesis, but thinks that it offers the best explanation of a number of difficulties.

The text of the *Prologue* and *Tale* used in this edition is, except for the correction of a very few errors, that of Skeat. It is followed by full notes dealing with grammatical and metrical points, variant manuscript readings, allusions to contemporary practices and ideas, and literary parallels and connexions. The allusions and parallels are particularly illuminating and fulfil the editor's aim of supplying the kind of 'explanation and interpretation' needed 'for an intelligent appreciation of the Tale' (Preface).

In *A Note on Chaucer's Pardonner's Prologue* (M.L.N., May) Edward H. Weatherly mentions a fresh parallel to the device of 'blackmail' employed by the Pardonner (C 377 ff.). In a fifteenth-century Latin collection of religious narrative in MS.

Harl. 3938 there is an *exemplum* in which this same trick is attributed to a pardoner of Ferrara. The fact that there exists both this *exemplum* and the already familiar analogue in the thirteenth-century German *Pfaffe Ameis* suggests to Weatherly that Chaucer may have had some contemporary source for his lines, possibly an *exemplum* very like this fifteenth-century one.

In Chaucer's '*Ladyes Foure and Twenty*' (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) Lilla Train, accepting the earlier opinion that the description in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* of the four-and-twenty ladies dancing 'under a forest syde' (D 989 ff.) is Chaucer's own addition to a well-known story, suggests that the poet obtained the idea for it from Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*. The passage in Map's work to which she refers has certain similarities with Chaucer's and it is, as Miss Train says, used by Map to make a transition in his narrative, as is Chaucer's fairy description.

Most of the remaining Chaucer studies consist of facts and surmises about the poet's life and family and, though it is very different in conception from the rest, it will be convenient to consider in this group the late George A. Plimpton's book, *The Education of Chaucer*.⁸ This is a beautifully produced volume containing more than forty reproductions from manuscripts that were in Plimpton's possession of medieval educational works and works which were consulted for scientific or other information. In the first chapter, which is entitled 'The World in Chaucer's Day', we have illustrations from manuscripts of the *Etymologies* of Isidore of Seville and the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* of Bartolomeus Anglicus and from a French manuscript roll, written about 1390, which contains a universal history down to the end of the fourteenth century. The second chapter, on Elementary Education, has illustrations from an English Primer almost contemporary with Chaucer, from another in French belonging to the early fifteenth century, and from a rare fifteenth-century manuscript of a work on arithmetic. Higher Education is represented by the Grammar of Donatus, the *Institutiones Grammaticae* of Priscian, a fourteenth-century

⁸ *The Education of Chaucer, illustrated from the School Books in Use in his Time*, by George A. Plimpton. O.U.P. pp. x + 176. 7s. 6d.

manuscript of Aristotle's *Ethics*, and manuscripts of works on mathematics and other subjects. Finally, in a chapter called 'General Reading', Plimpton reproduces pages from scientific works, from Wycliffe's Bible and a fourteenth-century East Anglian Vulgate, from some of the most famous medieval books, such as the *Roman de la Rose* and *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, and from medieval manuscripts of the classics. Plimpton accompanies these illustrations by a running commentary, indicating the part these books played in the education of the medieval child and pointing out Chaucer's dependence on or interest in them wherever possible.

He concludes his book with an Appendix containing several useful reference lists; for instance, lists of the Biblical and mythological characters mentioned by Chaucer, of the classical and medieval authors whose names are mentioned in his works, and of the theologians and saints to whom he refers by name.

The book, with its many beautiful reproductions of rare or interesting manuscripts, should indeed serve, as the author hoped it might, to make the educational system of the medieval world a more living thing to students of Chaucer.

The point at issue in Robert A. Pratt's letter, *Chaucer and Boccaccio* (*T.L.S.*, Feb. 28), is whether Chaucer could have met Boccaccio in 1373 when the English poet was in Florence. Pratt shows that the documentary evidence that has been quoted for Boccaccio's presence at Certaldo (30 miles from Florence) on 19 March 1373 really refers to 19 March 1374 by our modern reckoning. It is therefore not certain that Boccaccio was at Certaldo when Chaucer was in Florence, nor, of course, is it certain that Chaucer would have visited him if he had been.

Hazel A. Stevenson in *A Possible Relation between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth* (*M.L.N.*, May) makes an over-ingenuous suggestion about the period for which Chaucer (in 1399) leased the house in the garden of Westminster Abbey. She notes that the rent was just over 53s., and Chaucer himself was (or probably was) 53 years old at the time, and she suggests that it amused him to 'add to the coincidence' and lease the house for 53 years.

Two notes in *P.Q.* (July) record information about members of Chaucer's family. In *A New Document concerning Robert Chaucer* Harold C. Whitford refers to a document in the *Rotuli Scotiae* (ed. by D. Macpherson) which mentions Chaucer's grandfather and which appears to have been overlooked by investigators into Chaucer's ancestry. The document records the appointment of Robert Chaucer as co-deputy for the purchase of wine for the use of the king while he was in the north on the Scottish campaign of 1310–11, thereby confirming the view that Robert was a vintner as well as a saddler. It also mentions Robert's co-deputy, Stephen de Bercote, who was, Whitford claims, a relative of his by marriage. Whitford thinks that Stephen de Bercote is 'a name to be reckoned with in further researches into the ancestry of Geoffrey Chaucer'.

In *A Note on Nicholas Chaucer* (*P.Q.*, July) C. R. Thompson refers to the known records concerning the London merchant Nicholas Chaucer, probably a relative of Geoffrey, and quotes three new ones, one in a *Letter-Book of the City of London*, 1355, and two in the *Close Rolls*, 1359 and 1360. It is worth noting that among the names which appear with Nicholas Chaucer's as witnesses to the last two documents are those of John Aubrey (probably a son of Andrew Aubrey who had business relations with the Chaucers) and of Robert de Strode. Thompson suggests that this Robert may have been a relative of the Ralph Strode whom some have identified as the 'philosophical Strode' of *Troilus*, v. 1857.

John M. Manly's recent note on *Mary Chaucer's First Husband* (cf. *The Year's Work*, xv. 102) is answered by Russell Krauss in *John Heyron of Newton Plecy, Somerset* (*Speculum*, April). Krauss suggests that Manly's note misses the point of his previous discussion of the identity of Mary Chaucer's first husband. Krauss did not deny that Mary married a John Heyron but that she married the John Heyron of Newton Plecy. Manly apparently thought that this particular John Heyron was her first husband, but it is quite impossible that he should have been, for he died in 1326, 'at which date Geoffrey's grandmother had already been married for three years to Richard Chaucer, her third husband'.

Several seventeenth- and eighteenth-century allusions to Chaucer, not recorded in Miss Spurgeon's collection, are cited by Dorothy F. Atkinson in *References to Chaucer* (*N. and Q.*, May 4) and in *Chaucer Allusions* (*N. and Q.*, Aug. 17). In *An Early Allusion to Chaucer?* (*T.L.S.*, April 18) Herbert G. Wright draws attention to the reference to the wrath of Melibeus in Gilbert Banester's metrical version of Boccaccio's story of Guiscardo and Ghismonda. The reference may be, as Zupitza concluded, to Chaucer's *Tale of Melibeus*; on the other hand Banester may, of course, have been thinking of the French *Mélibée. Another 'Canterbury Tale'* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.), by Louis W. Chappell, records the use of the phrase 'a Canterbury Tale' (apparently meaning 'a tall story', or simply, 'a story') by Col. William Byrd in the first half of the eighteenth century (cf. *The Westover Manuscripts*, 1841, p. 20).

The last Chaucer item to be mentioned is the useful *Chaucer Bibliography*⁹ compiled by W. E. Martin, which continues the work of Miss Hammond and D. D. Griffith down to the year 1933. With some slight modifications the classification of the items is the same as in Griffith's *Bibliography*, so that it will be easy to use the two together. Two appendices contain a few corrections of Griffith's work and a large number of items supplementing those in Miss Hammond's *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual*. Martin's *Bibliography* covers the ground of Chaucer scholarship during the specified years with remarkable thoroughness and few items of any importance appear to have escaped his net. Those that he has missed are mostly publications either of a general kind or mainly concerned with some other group of medieval writings. Among them the following may be mentioned as being of value to students of Chaucer: *Characters in Medieval Literature* (*M.L.N.*, Jan. 1925) by H. R. Patch; *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic* (1928) by C. S. Baldwin; *Seasons and Months* (1933) by R. Tuve; and the series of articles by A. McI. Trounce entitled *The English tail-rhyme romances*, *Medium Ævum* (1932-4), especially the first article.

⁹ *A Chaucer Bibliography, 1925-1933*, by Willard E. Martin, Jr. C.U.P. and Duke Univ. Press. pp. xii+97. 7s.

Only one study concerned with Gower appears to have been published this year, an article on *Rhetoric in Gower's To King Henry the Fourth, in Praise of Peace* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.) by R. Balfour Daniels. The author first draws attention to an apparent reminiscence of a passage in Geoffrey de Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova* in the play on the name Innocent in the *Vox Clamantis*, iii. 955–6. The resemblance between these passages was first pointed out by Macaulay, but Daniels is able to strengthen the likelihood that Gower actually had the *Poetria Nova* in mind by the discovery of a second passage, thirty lines before the other, which again seems reminiscent of Geoffrey.

Daniels suggests that Gower made more use of rhetoric than has been thought and notes that, in spite of his disclaimer in the *Confessio Amantis*, viii. 3106–19, there is more than one example, even in this work, of his use of rhetorical devices. Indeed, the disclaimer itself may be, like that of Chaucer's eagle in the *Hous of Fame*, an instance of irony, 'the *permutatio* of the rhetoricians'. In any case, there is no doubt of the rhetorical influence in the later poem, *To King Henry IV*, and Daniels produces some excellent examples of a large number of rhetorical figures. He notes that though such devices as *traductio*, *contentio*, and word play (*adnominatio*) occur frequently, and Gower makes much use of the *sententia* and the *exemplum*, he is sparing in his use of 'tropes'. In view of the nature of his subject this is perhaps surprising, for it might have been thought that it would 'call for the *gravis stilus* and the *ornatus difficilis* rather than the easy means of ornamentation'; but, as Daniels remarks, the real hero of the poem is Christ, and Gower evidently felt that a simple style was best fitted to express his conception.

With the publication of the fourth part of his edition of Lydgate's *Troy Book*¹⁰ Henry Bergen brings to a conclusion the great task which he began more than thirty years ago. The three preceding volumes (published 1906, 1908, and 1910) contained the text of the work, and the present volume presents the critical apparatus arranged in four main sections. The first, headed Bibliographical Introduction, includes a full description of the

¹⁰ *Lydgate's Troy Book*, Part IV, ed. by Henry Bergen. O.U.P. for E.E.T.S. pp. viii + 572. 15s.

nineteen known manuscripts and of the two early printed editions of 1513 (Pynson) and 1555 (Thomas Marshe). Thomas Heywood's modernized version of the *Troy Book* (1614) is also described and several extracts from it, including the whole of the Prologue, are reprinted for comparison with Lydgate's own work. The discussion of the relationship of the manuscripts and early printed texts is a brief one, the editor having omitted most of the variant readings used as evidence, because they have been already printed in his dissertation on the subject.

The second section, Notes on Guido delle Colonne, contains over a hundred pages of extracts taken from the earliest printed text of the *Historia Troiana*, with footnotes giving variant readings from the Cologne edition of 1477 and the three fourteenth-century manuscripts in the British Museum. The running commentary which accompanies these extracts indicates where Lydgate amplifies the *Historia* or adds passages entirely his own. The actual Notes on Lydgate's Text, which form the third section, occupy comparatively few pages, and are mostly explanatory in the simplest sense, that is, they are translations or paraphrases of difficult passages in the text. There are, however, some which indicate pronunciations necessary for the metre and a few on allusions of various kinds and on Lydgate's use of writers other than Guido. Reminiscences of Chaucer are sometimes noted, but not always; for instance, Lydgate's not uninteresting version of stanza 265 of Book V of *Troilus and Criseyde* (cf. *Troy Book*, iii. 4224 ff.) receives no comment.

The Glossary, which occupies the fourth section, indicates very fully the various senses in which words are used in this text, including the phrases and idioms in which they occur. When a word is used in a sense not recorded in the *O.E.D.*, this is noted, and also when Lydgate's use of a word or of a particular meaning antedates the earliest reference given there. In these ways the glossary forms a valuable addition to our knowledge of fifteenth-century usage.

V

MIDDLE ENGLISH

II. BEFORE AND AFTER CHAUCER

By MARY S. SERJEANTSON

FOR the year 1935 there are no such exciting discoveries to report as there were in 1934. The work of the year shows very varied interests; the medieval lyric has perhaps received the greatest share of attention. In this direction R. L. Greene's work on the Carol deserves note, as also the fact that a number of lyrics have this year been printed for the first time, or are now made easily accessible. Notices of useful editions of some important Middle English poems will be found below, as well as of a new translation of *Piers Plowman*, and of an edition of the Peniarth copy of the *Play of Antichrist*.

In the present chapter the following order has been adopted: works of general interest; works on individual poems not falling into any general group; books and articles on Langland; the lyric; romances, and all writings on 'the matter of Britain'; chronicles in verse and prose; other prose, early and late; plays. The chapter finally deals with editions of and critical work on Middle English writings of social, historical, and technical, rather than literary, interest.

The most ambitious work of the year has been the fine reproduction of the *Canterbury Psalter*,¹ with a long and valuable introduction by the late M. R. James on the texts and illustrations and innumerable matters arising therefrom. It is now generally agreed that this Psalter was produced in the mid-twelfth century—possibly in 1145 or soon after—and that Eadwine's work was based on the Utrecht Psalter. The present volume is an important addition to the number of excellent facsimile reproductions which have appeared within the last decade.

¹ *The Canterbury Psalter: A Reproduction, with Introduction by M. R. James.* Lund, Humphries. £6 6s.

A note on the date of the *Canterbury Psalter* by H. Hidemann appears in *Geistige Arbeit* (II. ii).

We welcome the latest supplement (the sixth)² of J. E. Wells's invaluable *Manual of Writings in Middle English*. The new volume includes additions and modifications up to July 1935. The arrangement follows that of previous volumes, and the new matter is very considerable. We note with much interest the editor's hope that his bibliography of fifteenth-century writings in English will appear before long.

It is pleasant to find that the 1935 volume of *P.M.L.A.* is dedicated to Carleton Brown, 'on the occasion of his twenty-fifth anniversary as Professor of English'. The December issue contains a bibliography of the writings of this scholar who has done so much for the study of Middle English.

An important work on *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English* is J. P. Oakden's book with this title.³ It is a companion to an earlier volume by the same author—a study devoted chiefly to the metre and dialect of Middle English alliterative verse (see *The Year's Work*, xi. 92–6). The present work treats of its vocabulary, phraseology, and style, and gives some account of the Early Middle English alliterative poetry and prose; also, at greater length, of the poems of the alliterative revival, classifying these under the headings of 'epic' chronicles, romances, satire and allegory, religious poetry, and miscellaneous later works. Oakden describes the character and subject-matter of each individual work, and in some instances he usefully summarizes and discusses various critical theories and recent investigations, as, for instance, in the case of *Winner and Waster* and of *Pearl*. (In the latter he makes no mention of Wellek's recent article; see *The Year's Work*, xv. 112–14.) The fifth chapter contains a general review of 'the rise of the

² *Sixth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1400*, by J. E. Wells. New Haven: Connecticut Academy and Yale Univ. Press. pp. 1437–1549. 6s. 6d.

³ *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English: a Survey of the Traditions*, by J. P. Oakden, with assistance from Elizabeth R. Innes. Manchester Univ. Press. pp. x+403. 20s.

[alliterative] school, its divisions, its achievements, and subsequent decay'. The author traces the continuous tradition from Old English to the fourteenth-century revival, when 'a renewed poetic vitality and inspiration' showed itself; this he ascribes to the stimulus of French poetry. 'The wit and brilliance of the French', however, 'made no appeal to the writers. . . . The heroic spirit, the high seriousness which came to them so naturally, found its only suitable embodiment in alliterative verse.' Oakden is inclined to accept the hypothesis of J. R. Hulbert that the revival took place in the cultural setting of a circle of baronial families in opposition to the court. He stresses the importance of the common poetic diction evolved by this group of writers, but he comes to the conclusion that 'except in the case of the *Gawain* poet no distinctive style is evolved, and the literary inspiration behind the Revival died before the point of maturity was ever reached'.

The second and larger part of this work analyses the vocabulary and the alliterative phrases of the Middle English alliterative revival; it includes also a considerable section on alliterative phrases in Old English verse and prose which, valuable as it is, seems somewhat out of place here. It is impossible to summarize this large and interesting collection of material, but it may be said that the result of this investigation is to strengthen the idea of an unbroken literary development from Old English to Middle English. A striking feature of the vocabulary is the large number of nominal compounds: 880 in the unrhymed alliterative verse. A comparative study of the alliterative phrases in non-alliterative poems is included, and the volume ends with two short chapters on some stylistic features: on the use of 'tags', on the absolute use of the adjective, and so forth.

Mediaeval Literature and the Comparative Method is the title of a brief essay by A. H. Krappe (*Speculum*, July), who emphasizes the importance of what he would prefer to call the 'inductive' study of the themes and 'motives' of medieval fiction, and comments on the undeserved neglect and mistrust of this method in Anglo-Saxon countries. He gives a number of examples of the interpretation and illumination of medieval stories by comparison with parallel tales, and discusses some

of the ways in which tales from the popular, oral, traditions may be modified in literary traditions.

Glastonbury Abbey and the Fusing of English Literary Culture is the subject of an interesting article by Clark H. Slover (*Speculum*, Apr.). Standing as it does 'on the borders of British territory, ruled successively by British, Anglo-Saxon, and Norman lords', the Abbey 'constituted for many years an international clearing-house of culture'. Slover expands and explains this statement by tracing the early history of the Abbey and its abbots, showing its ecclesiastical relations with Ireland, Wales, Northumbria, and the rest of England, and with social and political life in Norman times, until 'during the period which marks the beginning of imaginative literary production, namely the twelfth century, Glastonbury Abbey was in the very center of English affairs', political and intellectual, and able 'to place at the disposal of Anglo-Norman writers a culture that had been gradually gathered and then preserved and fused through six centuries of close contact with the diverse national elements of Britain'.

'It is safe to say that wherever there were good books in the Middle Ages there too could be found a copy of one or another of the works of Boethius.' H. R. Patch⁴ has done the student a service in preparing a short but scholarly and readable account of the influence of this sixth-century scholar on whose tomb was inscribed: 'Ecce Boetius celo magnus | et omni mundo mirificandus homo.' The story is a remarkable one, and though for the most part the author 'has tried to keep to what, if not at least well established, may be regarded as generally acceptable', there is a considerable amount of original matter in, as well as of originality in the presentation of, the book. Beginning with a short account of the few known facts of the life of Boethius, Patch then proceeds to give an interesting survey of the traditions which became attached to his name. The second chapter describes the wide distribution of manuscripts

⁴ *The Tradition of Boethius: A Study of his Importance in Medieval Culture*, by Howard Rollin Patch. New York: O.U.P. pp. viii+200. 10s. 6d.

of Boethius, the use made by medieval scholars of his works, and his influence in dialectic, in arithmetic, in music, in geometry, in scholastic controversies, and especially in philosophy, showing how he transmitted to the Middle Ages 'not only something of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, but also a good deal of Plato's *Timaeus*'. The *Consolatio* is dealt with at some length, in particular its central problem: 'chance in its relation to God and Divine foresight, and in relation to man and his longings to shape his own destiny', which Boethius solves by the belief 'that Fate or chance—all that is apparently casual and changeable—is in the last analysis under the control of a rational God'.

The translations of the *Consolatio* are then noticed, reference being made to versions in English, German, French, Anglo-Norman, Provençal, Italian, Spanish, Catalan, Flemish, Dutch, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Polish. A few of the more important western European versions are treated more fully, notably that of Notker Labeo of St. Gall in German, and, in English, those of King Alfred, Chaucer, John Walton, George Colville, Sir Thomas Chaloner, Queen Elizabeth, and the translation which appeared in 1609, ascribed to 'I. T.' (Patch accepts the suggestion that this last was the work of Michael Walpole.) The fourth chapter describes the permeation of medieval literature of western Europe (both in Latin and in some of the vernaculars) by the thought and outlook of the *Consolatio*, and the account is continued for England into the early part of the Renaissance period.

The writer provides a considerable bibliography, and a series of notes gives many other bibliographical references bearing on individual points in the text. There is an index, and the book is illustrated by seven plates reproduced from miniatures in manuscripts of Boethius or his followers.

Mary Frances Smith has produced a doctoral dissertation⁵ which seeks 'to show the variety and nature of the concepts of wisdom expressed by [M.E.] authors'. Beginning with a brief study of the phases, qualities, personifications, and symbols

⁵ *Wisdom and Personification of Wisdom occurring in Middle English Literature before 1500*, by Mary Frances Smith. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America. pp. xi+199.

of wisdom which appear in the Bible, she proceeds to make clear by many quotations and references how these concepts are severally reflected in the Middle English writings of many kinds, and re-emphasizes the prevailing Biblical knowledge of the period. The writer divides the subject into four categories: worldly wisdom (including both prudence and cunning), prophetic wisdom (including saints, sibyls, and other visionaries), the wisdom of folly, and divine wisdom (particularly as revealed in the Second Person of the Trinity).

The English outlaw-tradition has been the subject of a study by J. de Lange,⁶ who sets out to investigate 'the points of contact between the English and Icelandic matter, and the historical, social, and traditional currents, by which the outlaw-traditions in both countries have been influenced. To see, furthermore, whether the two developments have influenced each other directly or whether their similarity is due to a common source.' He discusses first in some detail the Tale of Gamelyn and the traditions of Hereward and Robin Hood. In regard to the latter it may be mentioned that he has overlooked a 'Robin Hood' place-name of the earlier fourteenth century (see A. H. Smith, *M.L.R.* xxvii), which argues against some of his conclusions concerning dates. The character of Robin Hood himself de Lange takes to be entirely imaginative in origin, and in no sense historical or political. Two other outlaw-themes are next examined, the tales of Fulk FitzWarin and Eustache the Monk, which he shows by parallelism of detail and episode to be also of English origin, and which help to build up his idea of the essential characteristics of the outlaw-hero: 'bodily strength, cunning, and courage'. De Lange then turns to the Icelandic tradition, analyses some of the Icelandic outlaw-tales (including that of Grettir), and traces some common elements in these and the English tales. But the chief link between the English and Icelandic outlaw-matter is the saga of An bogsveigir, the elements of which de Lange traces back to pre-Icelandic times, suggesting a common ultimate source in Norway for the English and Icelandic tales.

⁶ *The Relation and Development of English and Icelandic Outlaw-traditions*, by J. de Lange. Haarlem: Willink and Zoon. pp. 138. f. 3.

Turning now to individual poems, and taking these in approximately chronological order, we come to the *Ormulum*. *The Riddle of the Ormulum* (*P.Q.*, July) is dealt with by H. B. Hinckley, who 'is concerned to show that the *Ormulum*, or at least the *Dedication* of it, was written between 1130 and 1140; and to re-examine the generally discarded theory . . . that it was written at Carlisle'. His theory is based on the evidence, as he reads it, of palaeography, language, and local history. He dates the handwriting of the manuscript about 1130-6; the language, he states, must be dated before 1150; in neither case are his arguments very satisfactory. He quotes, as an illustration of the Cumberland dialect, a thirteenth-century copy (obviously Southern) of Gospatrix's Charter of the eleventh century, but admits 'that the linguistic resemblance between *Charter* and *Ormulum* are not impressive'. On the whole, the paper does not carry the argument very far.

Continuing his important studies on Orm, H. C. Matthes deals once more with the problem of *Quellenauswertung und Quellenberufung im Orrmulum* (*Anglia*, lix), in which he restates his position, and adduces more evidence to support his arguments. This article is in part, and one in *Anglia Beiblatt* (Apr.), *Zum literarischen Charakter und zu den Quellen des Ormulum*, is wholly, a refutation of the arguments put forward by H. Glunz against the theories of Matthes expressed in his work *Zur Einheitlichkeit des Orrmulum* (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 145-8). The discussion is continued by Glunz in *Zur Orrmulumfrage*, also in *Anglia Beiblatt* (June).

G. Linke has added to the small number of full glossaries of Middle English texts by issuing a concordance to *Genesis and Exodus*.⁷ The compiler prefers facts to explanation or comment, even when these might be particularly helpful. He finds 1,955 words in the vocabulary of the poem, of which he reckons 13·7 per cent. are of foreign origin: Scandinavian 16·5 per cent., French 6·1 per cent., Low-German 0·5 per cent., Latin 0·2 per cent. Of significant words he finds that 1,057 were already

⁷ *Der Wortschatz des mittelenglischen Epos Genesis und Exodus mit grammatischer Einleitung*, by Gerhard Linke. (*Palaestra*, 197.) Leipzig: Mayer and Müller. pp. 165. RM. 4.80.

established in earlier English religious literature, while 603 appear to be peculiar to *Genesis and Exodus*. The glossary is printed in the same type throughout; this, with the great number of abbreviations which this method of printing emphasizes, is trying to the eyes. It is to be regretted that all the Old English words are given in their West-Saxon form, which in many cases obviously could not be the ancestor of the *Genesis and Exodus* form. The author indicates whether the words occur in certain other Middle English texts of the first half of the thirteenth century: the *Ormulum*, the *Katherine Group*, the *Ancren Riwe*, the *O.E. Homilies*, and the *Bestiary*, the last three only in so far as their vocabularies have been recorded by Stratmann and Mätzner. The monograph contains a very brief sketch of the phonology and of the inflexions of the poem, for the most part only treating of those points which can be illustrated by rhymes. There is also a summarized comparison with the dialect of Robert of Brunne, which Linke finds slightly but definitely more northerly.

The long-awaited E.E.T.S. edition of *The Owl and the Nightingale*⁸ has now appeared, and the very careful diplomatic reproduction of the two manuscripts of the text will be heartily welcomed. The edition was planned, and the text prepared, by the late G. F. H. Sykes more than a quarter of a century ago, but in view of the fact that two critical texts have made their appearance since then, the present editor judged it more useful to print a parallel-text edition which should be as near to the manuscripts as printing would allow. The manuscript word-division, punctuation, and accentuation have all been kept, and indication is given of the spacing of the manuscripts, as well as of the varying forms of individual letters. The ordinary Middle English contractions have been expanded, however, those which are less common being retained. The text is well supplied with footnotes on points of palaeography, and many problems of interpretation are discussed in the interesting notes at the end of the volume. The introduction gives details of the method of editing the text; it also contains notes on some

⁸ *The Owl and the Nightingale*, ed. by J. H. G. Grattan and G. F. H. Sykes. (E.E.T.S., E.S. cxlx.) O.U.P. pp. xxiv+94. 15s.

palaeographical features (e.g. on the interchange of *thorn* and *wen*, and on word-division), on the manuscripts and their pedigree, on the dialect (which the editor accepts as being that of Surrey, both originally and in the extant form of the text), on the 'occasion and date of composition of the poem', and on the authorship. These last two problems the editor leaves unsolved. A bibliography is given, containing chiefly books and articles not included in Atkins's bibliography, and a glossarial index is also supplied.

In *A Middle English Paraphrase of John of Hoveden's 'Philomena' and the Text of his 'Viola'* (M.L.R., July) F. J. E. Raby shows that the poem *Philomena* (ed. by Clemens Blume, Leipzig, 1930) is the source of the *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ* (ed. by C. D'Evelyn, E.E.T.S., 1921). 'This translation is a witness to Hoveden's influence in the fourteenth century, and affords evidence in support of the contention that he is a link between the Bernardine-Franciscan movement and the great English mystical movement of the fourteenth century.' In the same article Raby prints the text of another poem by Hoveden—a remarkable and ingenious hymn to the Blessed Virgin, consisting of two hundred and fifty rhymed lines, in which each rhyme is repeated for fifty consecutive lines.

The Prick of Conscience: A Collation of MSS. Galba E IX and Harley 4196 is the title of a short article (*Leeds Studies in English*, No. 4), in which J. Lightbown corrects from the manuscripts R. Morris's text (Philological Soc., 1863), which was printed from Galba with deficiencies made up from Harley. The corrections are mostly of a minor character, but are none the less welcome.

Bruce Dickins (T.L.S., Dec. 14) explains and justifies the reading *Put(t)idew* in *The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedy*, v. 189, as in the Chapman and Myllar and Maitland texts, in place of the *Pettedew* of the Bannatyne manuscript.

The next paragraphs deal with the year's work on *Piers Plowman*.

It is to be hoped that a version of *Piers Plowman* in readable

Modern English will make many free of ‘the field full of folk’ whose apparent difficulties of diction have been a barrier to the ordinary reader. Henry W. Wells’s translation⁹ attempts to give us the rhythm and alliteration of the original, and usually succeeds in avoiding the use of obsolete words merely for the sake of alliteration. On the other hand, the translator sometimes wisely employs an obsolete or obsolescent word for a disused object or practice in preference to substituting a definition (e.g. *cocket* or *clerematzyn bread*). Some will regret the conflation of all three texts to produce a version which, though it may not omit any of the finest points of A or B or C, is not what the poet designed or wrote. Though individual details of translation might be questioned, and one wonders why certain words or phrases of the original were taken and others left, and why some notes were added where there is little difficulty while some real difficulties are not explained, Wells has done a hard task well and deserves our thanks. Nevill Coghill contributes a short introduction with a sketch of the (probable) course of Langland’s life, and an account of the allegorical meanings of the poem.

In a somewhat captious article entitled *The Langland Myth* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) Oscar Cargill contends that the author of *Piers Plowman* was not called William Langland, and offers an explanation of the note in the Dublin MS. on ‘Stacy de Rokayle pater Willielmi de Longlond’. How did this note get into the manuscript, and how far is its evidence dependable? Cargill quotes the two lines (B xx. 220–1) on the *mansen prest of þe march of yrlonde*, which he believes ‘were aimed at a specific individual’, whom he identifies with a certain Walter de Brugge, parson of Trim and prebendary of Howth, whose character would seem to have fitted the passage in the poem, and who in his will, dated 1396, left to a priest of his parish ‘unum librum vocatum Pers Plowman’. Cargill conjectures that de Brugge heard he had been attacked in this poem, sent for a copy, and made inquiries about the author. This

⁹ *The Vision of Piers Plowman*, by William Langland, newly rendered into Modern English by H. W. Wells. Sheed and Ward. pp. xxix + 304. 8s. 6d.

copy might be the one now in Trinity College, Dublin ; the note on the authorship may have been inserted by de Brugge himself, and may possibly represent a conflation of two reports on the identity of the writer. Cargill rejects the theory that William Langland was an illegitimate son of Stacy de Rokayle, chiefly on account of the poet's harshness in speaking of illegitimacy. He proceeds to show how in his opinion the 'Langland myth' originated and developed, discussing the entries in manuscripts and in Bale's Note-book and Catalogue. The last part of the article investigates the theory which takes the author of *Piers Plowman* to be a son of Stacy de Rokele ; he adduces forty-three entries in medieval records which show that there was a William Rokayle or Rokele, or more than one, in the fourteenth century. A number of these items connect the Rokele family with East Anglia, with which the family of But was also connected (Cargill points out incidentally that one MS., Rawl. Poet. 38, was in the possession of 'William Buttes' in the early sixteenth century), and, the writer believes, some of them show at least a possibility that William de (la) Rokele came into contact with such people as Thomas Brunton, Bishop of Rochester, and the above-mentioned Walter de Brugge. The suggestions or hints afforded by the records are of a very general character, but further discoveries about the family of Rokele might tend to support the theories here considered.

The Bishop of Rochester just mentioned is particularly interesting to the student of *Piers Plowman*, since one of his sermons is claimed to have been the source of Langland's use of the fable of the rat-parliament. Eleanor H. Kellogg in *Bishop Brunton and the Fable of the Rats* (*P.M.L.A.*, Mar.) produces a considerable body of evidence from the manuscript arrangement of Brunton's extant sermons to support the belief of F. A. Gasquet that the date of this sermon was 1376. Miss Kellogg gives reasons for placing the rat-sermon on the fifth Sunday after Easter, May 18, in that year. She, however, disagrees with G. R. Owst's suggestion that Brunton is to be regarded as the prototype of the 'angel of heuene' who spoke 'in the eyre on heigh' in the B-text prologue, an identification which Cargill, in the article dealt with above, accepts without hesitation.

S. B. James's book *Back to Langland*¹⁰ is another attempt to present *Piers Plowman* to the modern reader, but since it is primarily addressed to those who do not know 'this neglected poet' it must not detain us. James represents Langland as the typical Englishman, Piers as the ideal peasant—'Christ in an English dress'—and feels that a return to Langland's outlook, especially in so far as he embodies 'the spiritual unity of the English people at the very moment when religion in England stood at the parting of the ways', might well be the salvation of a shaken world.

Again in the *Dublin Review* (Jan.–Mar.) the same writer considers *The Neglect of Langland* by the non-specialized public, and emphasizes the importance of his ideas for the modern age.

A monograph by Heinrich Wiehe¹¹ examines the attitude of Langland towards the various social classes and conceptions of his day: the king, the nobility, the knights, the clergy, the law, industry and commerce, the commons and the labouring classes, and studies also Langland's own spiritual outlook. He stresses Langland's position as a conservative reformer, as opposed to a revolutionary reformer, and believes that the actual influence and effect of the poem on the social unrest of the day were due to the adoption and repetition by the leaders of unrest of single lines and passages and ideas from the poem separated from their context.

Nevill Coghill's *Two Notes on Piers Plowman* (*Med. Ev.*, June) deal with 'The Abbot of Abingdon and the Date of the C Text' and with 'Chaucer's Debt to Langland'. The first offers an interpretation of the passage beginning *Ac there shal come a kyng* and ending *Ac Dowel shal dyngen hym adoune. & destruyen his myzte* (B x. 317–30), particularly vv. 321–2 and 329–30; the first of these groups he believes to be corrupt, and his explanation of the passage depends on some additions, but is 'consistent with its general meaning'. In the last two lines Coghill identifies the king with Christ at the Second Advent, and Cayme with Anti-Christ; the Abbot of Abingdon is 'simply

¹⁰ *Back to Langland*, by Stanley B. James. Sands. pp. 167. 3s. 6d.

¹¹ *Piers Plowman und die sozialen Fragen seiner Zeit*, by H. Wiehe. (Münster diss.) pp. 73.

any abbot who is lax in the government of his abbey ; the place Abingdon was chosen fortuitously ; it had a well-known abbey, and *first-rate alliterative possibilities*'. Langland was being only vaguely prophetic here ; the passage was not intended as an exact prediction, and the fact that later events seemed to fulfil a prophecy in these lines was merely coincidence. The C Text change from *the Abbot of Abingdon* to *the Abbot of Englonde* seems to Coghill to fix the date of this text to the year 1394, when the tenants of the Abbot of Abingdon did actually rise against him, and Langland, to avoid a possibly dangerous topical allusion, altered the wording of the passage.

Coghill's second note gives a number of reasons and quotes a number of passages which suggest that Chaucer was acquainted with *Piers Plowman*, and was influenced by its ideas and characters, particularly in the person of the Plowman himself.

We have an important addition to the literature of the medieval lyric in R. L. Greene's anthology of, and long introductory essay on, the Carol.¹² He bases his selection on 'the basis, not of their subject-matter, but of their metrical form. They include only poems intended, or at least suitable, for singing, made up of uniform stanzas and provided with a burden which begins the piece and is to be repeated after each stanza.' The collection comprises all carols extant down to 1550, when the type seems to have become rather suddenly obsolescent or obsolete. Four hundred and seventy-four poems are here printed, with textual, bibliographical, and explanatory notes, with references to such musical settings as have survived. The carols are classified by running head-lines, which allow for some overlapping, into Carols of the Nativity, of the Epiphany, Lullaby Carols, Carols of Doomsday, Picaresque Carols, &c. The introduction begins with a justification of the author's definition of a carol, comparing it with other lyric forms (some of dance-song origin) such as the *balade* and *virelai*, in connexion with which it is not infrequently mentioned in English and French literature. The writer then proceeds to consider its origin and relations (e.g. the German *Reienlied*), tracing the

¹² *The Early English Carols*, ed. by Richard Leighton Greene. O.U.P. pp. cxlv + 461. 30s.

probable influence of dance-rhythm on the form, and the probable manner of the performance of the carol in its early days. A chapter on the Latin background indicates the influence of the Latin Hymns and Proses on subject-matter and on the form of the stanza, and succeeding chapters treat of various aspects of the type: the carol as popular song (in which it is contrasted with the ballad), the carol in relation to popular religion with an account of the writing of religious lyrics on the pattern of secular lyrics, partly as a deliberate effort on the part of the Church to reform and sanctify popular merry-makings which tended to attach themselves to Church festivals, and the special connexion of the carol with the Franciscans. The last chapter deals with the burden, as the distinctive feature of this genre, based ultimately on choral repetition, not so bound up with the body of any one poem that it cannot be transferred to another, but having at least a general tendency to sound the key-note of the stanzas which it accompanies. The number of poems in the regular form of burden+stanza which Greene has assembled is a little surprising, and they are of a remarkable variety, though the majority of them are religious in character. It may be noticed that rather more than a quarter of the whole number are associated with the Christmas and New Year season, a proportion which Greene attributes to the importance of this period as a time of popular rejoicing—‘the response of the carol-writers to the challenge which the popular Christmas customs presented to their special veneration for the season’.

Under the heading *Mittelenglische Marienstunden* Karl Brunner publishes in *Eng. Stud.* (Apr.) a sixteenth-century copy (from MS. Arundel 285, ff. 141 v., 142 r.) of a Middle English rhymed poem in thirty-six lines on the Seven Sorrows of Our Lady, arranged for the daily Offices. The poem, which is, at least in its present form, in a northern dialect, is closely related to certain versions of the *Patris Sapientia*. Some of the rhymes are interesting (e.g. *hert*: *part*; *tre*: *Mary*), but do not afford evidence as to the original dialect of the poem. It has not before been printed.

The same writer has also (*Eng. Stud.*, Aug.) edited *Zwei*

Gedichte aus der Handschrift Trinity College, Cambridge, 323 (B.14.39), with introduction and notes on the text. The manuscript (which contains one of the copies of the *Proverbs of Alfred*) has been previously described; it is of the first half of the thirteenth century. Of the two poems here printed, only a few stanzas of the second have appeared before. The first, which consists of 132 lines in short couplets, is a set of paraphrases of biblical texts and passages from theological treatises; the second, 344 seven-stress lines in quatrains, mostly rhyming *a a a a*, gives a brief account of some episodes of Old and New Testament history and of a few of the martyrs. The poem is followed by five lines containing an invocation to St. Cuthbert, and a note on the date of Easter. An analysis of the dialect leads the editor to place the poem 'im Südwesten Englands, wenn auch vielleicht nicht direkt im westsächsischen Gebiet'. The qualifying clause certainly seems necessary in view of such forms as *mon*, *stont*; *heren*, &c.

Under the title *Verstreute me. und frühne. Lyrik*, Karl Hammerle (*Archiv*, Jan.) edits two Middle English O- and I-poems, a fifteenth-century poem on St. George, arranged for the canonical hours, and two later lyrics, one a schoolboy's song, the other a Christmas carol. The first of the five is a fragment of sixty-nine lines on the Crucifixion, preserved in MS. Ashmole 41, and belongs to the end of the fourteenth century; it is in seven-stress lines, in stanzas of six lines, rhyming *a a a a b b*; the style resembles that of the school of Richard Rolle. The second, with the same metrical form as the first, consists of twenty-four lines in a fifteenth-century MS. (Oxford, Univ. Coll. 33), and is a didactic poem beginning *While þu hast gode and getest gode. for gode þu miȝt beholde*; the first stanza is represented by another version in the 'Banatyne manuscript'. Poem III is in a hand of the later fifteenth century in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library (e Musaeo 35). Except for the *Hours of Our Lady* dealt with above, this poem is the only example in ME. of devotions to the saints arranged for the daily Offices. The eighty-four lines are in quatrains of seven-stress lines rhyming *a a a a*. It is of northern origin.

The last two poems are from a manuscript (B.M. Addit.

14997) of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, the chief contents of which are Welsh poems. The schoolboy's song is a macaronic poem of five couplets, beginning:

On days when J am callit to þe scole de matre et matertera
Then my hert begynnys to cole languescunt mentes viscera.

The carol, apart from the refrain *Hay ay hay ay make we mere as we may*, consists of five quatrains, beginning *Now ys zole comyn with gentyll chere*. This is included in Greene's collection discussed above.

Karl Brunner prints with comments in the same number of *Archiv* the text of five hitherto unpublished *Mittelenglische Todesgedichte*, from manuscripts of the fifteenth century. The first is a translation (in MS. Cotton Faustina B vi, and in two other MSS.) of three of the Latin *Vado mori* distichs. The second is a sixteen-line Dispute concerning the Soul of the Dead, from the same manuscript. The third is an allegory of the Life of Man, and is found in MS. B.M. Addit. 37049; it contains eighteen complete couplets and parts of three others. The fourth is a Warning of Death, in twelve stanzas in rhyme-royal in the same manuscript. The last is a Dispute between Worms and a Corpse, also in rhyme-royal, thirty-one stanzas and ten introductory lines, from the same manuscript. All these poems are illustrated, or serve as descriptions or explanations of pictures.

The *Antiquaries Journal* (Jan.) publishes the text of *Two Medieval Love-Songs set to Music*, one of which was discovered by John Saltmarsh, the present editor, in the Muniment Room of King's College, Cambridge; the other is from a manuscript in the Public Record Office. The first consists of three four-lined verses, rhyming *a b a b*, beginning: *bryd one brere, brid, brid one brere*. It is written, with its musical setting, on the back of a contemporary copy of a Papal Bull, dated 1199, dealing with a matter concerning the Priory of St. James by Exeter, the property of which was granted to King's College at the Dissolution. The editor gives the date of the handwriting as fourteenth century—probably within the first thirty years. The dialect is probably Midland. The second lyric consists of seven three-line stanzas with a two-line refrain which stands at the head of the poem (i.e. in carol-form): *Alone I lyue, alone, and sore I*

syghe for one. It is written, again with the musical setting, 'on the back of an official document: the draft findings of an inquiry into a riot, held in the summer of 1457'. The hand-writing of the lyric, however, is of about the middle of the reign of Henry VIII; the music points to the same period.

The editor gives a full description of text, language, and style of both lyrics, and a facsimile of the text and music of each is also given. F. McD. C. Turner adds a note on, and transcribes the music of, *Bryd one Brere*, and E. J. Dent does the same for *Alone I Lyue*.

In *Anglia*, lix. 319–21, Ferdinand Holthausen prints a critical text of *Ein mittelenglisches Gedicht über die Fünf Freuden Marias*, first published in the same periodical (vol. xxx) by W. Heuser. The poem consists of five eight-line stanzas, rhyming *a b a b b c b c*. Immediately following it in the manuscript is a stanza of six lines which may or may not belong to it; this stanza is an acrostic, the six initial letters forming the word *Pipwel*, the name (now Pipewell) of a Cistercian monastery in Northamptonshire.

In the same number, Karl Brunner produces for the first time *Ein typisches Bußgedicht aus dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert*. The text consists of fifteen seven-line stanzas, *a b a b b c c*. It is extant in two manuscripts: H M 501 in the Huntington Library, and Gg 4.31 in the Cambridge University Library, where it is called *A goodly preær*. The former provides the better text, and is the basis of the present edition; the variants of the other manuscripts are given in footnotes.

Bruce Dickins prints (*Leeds Studies in English*, 4) two *Worcester Fragments of the Middle English Secular Lyric* not previously published in any Middle English anthology, or noted by Wells. One is from Worcester Cathedral MS. F. 64, f. 68 (thirteenth century), written as prose but forming three lines of verse; the other from MS. Q. 50, f. 46 r., six lines, which should probably be arranged metrically in ten lines; this begins *Ne saltou neuer, leuedi, Tuynklen wyt bin eyen*. The part of the manuscript in which this item occurs is of 1270–80. Dickins adds notes on the poem, which contains some interesting forms and rhymes (e.g. *ofte*: *a-bout*, = *aboht*).

Writing on *The Date of the Early English Translation of the 'Candet Nudatum Pectus'* (*Med. Æv.*, June) S. Harrison Thomson shows that there are 'two completely distinct translations of the *Candet*: one in four lines, current in at least three recensions and perhaps four by the middle of the thirteenth century' (three of the texts are printed by Carleton Brown in *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*), 'the second, in six lines, in two recensions, at least a quarter of a century later', found in MS. Digby 55 (and printed here) and in B.M. Addit. 11579. Thompson discusses the palaeographical and other evidence afforded by the Durham and Bodleian manuscripts of the earlier translation, and suggests that it was produced 'somewhere in the region of Leicestershire or Lincolnshire . . . towards the end of the first third of the thirteenth century'.

'*The Question of Halsam*' is the title given in one manuscript (B.M. Addit. 34360) to a lyric consisting of one stanza in rhyme-royal, which, together with another single-stanza lyric, is the subject of an article by Helen Pennock South (*P.M.L.A.*, June). Both poems are to be found in a number of manuscripts, either alone or together. They have at various times been considered to be the work of Lydgate, though certain of the manuscripts have notes ascribing them to *Halsam Squiere* or *Halsham Esquier*. Miss South now proposes to identify this Halsam with 'Johannes Halsham, armiger', whose inquisition post mortem is recorded in the third year of Henry V (1415), and who died seised of lands in Sussex, Kent, Norfolk, and Wiltshire. She has amassed a considerable amount of detail concerning his life; as she admits, there is no proof or even suggestion that he was a poet, though his character, standing, and local connexions make the ascription of these two lyrics to him not unjustifiable.

A. S. C. Ross has re-edited *The Middle English Poem on the Names of a Hare* (*Proc. of Leeds Philos. and Lit. Soc.* III. vi) from MS. Digby 86. This curious production, apparently of the late thirteenth century, 'contains a ritual to be observed on meeting a hare and the central 44 lines (vv. 11-54) consist of 77 terms of abuse which are to be applied to it. The majority of these are ἀπαξ λεγόμενα and very obscure.' These terms and matters

of interest arising from them and other words in the poem are very fully annotated. For comparison Ross prints, with a modern rendering, a fourteenth-century Welsh poem on the hare: Dafydd ap Gwilym's *Cywyllyd yr Ysgyfarnog*.

In a note on *The Rhyme-Schemes in MS. Douce 302, 53 and 54*, Bruce Dickins (*Proc. of Leeds Philos. and Lit. Soc.* II. viii) suggests a number of emendations for two of the poems (Nos. 53 and 54) which appear among the writings of John Audelay in MS. Douce 302. The poems in question 'are to be assigned to an area a good deal further north than Audelay's Shropshire'. They are rhymed and also partly alliterative. The metrical scheme is highly elaborate, and in the text as now extant it appears to break down in about twenty places. Dickins believes 'that in almost every instance the reasonable assumption that the poet was capable of carrying it through with consistency gives a reading which not merely restores the metrical scheme but often improves the sense'. Acting on this assumption, he then proposes emendations in sixteen of the apparently faulty lines.

Kemp Malone in *E.L.H.* (Apr.) supplies a number of comments on the text and additions to the Glossary of Carleton Brown's *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*.

The next group to be considered is that of the Romances. In a note on *Havelock* 64–6 Bruce Dickins (*Leeds Studies in English*, 4) has a new suggestion to make on the lines

Was non so bold lond to rome
Dat durste upon his bringhe
Hunger ne here wicke þinghe.

He supports the manuscript-reading *hunger ne here* as 'a traditional alliterative phrase' (often *here* and *hunger*, &c.) of Old and Middle English, citing illustrations of its use from the *Lambeth Homilies*, *Owl and Nightingale*, and *Arthour and Merlin*, and translates v. 66 as 'famine nor devastation—evil things'. He accepts Sir William Craigie's emendation of *lond* to *louerd*, now usually adopted, but in the obviously short line 65 would add *londe* after *his* (in place of the Skeat-Sisam *menie*), as this would help to explain the mistake in v. 64.

G. Taylor (*Leeds Studies in English*, 4) continues the *Notes on Athelstan* begun last year (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 108) with a brief analysis of the dialect of the poem, giving his reasons for supposing it to be slightly more northerly than that of Robert of Brunne, and possibly 'as far north as the Humber'; the scribe's dialect was 'more Southerly than that of the Romance'. Localization in North Lincolnshire disagrees with the conclusion of the recent editor of the text, A. Mcl. Trounce, who assigned it to Norfolk on linguistic and other grounds which Taylor also disputes.

G. P. Faust has made a study of the structure of the romance of *Sir Degare*,¹³ and of the relations between the various texts. The romance is extant in two manuscripts of the fourteenth century (one fragmentary), two of the fifteenth century, three black-letter prints, and one manuscript ('all very closely related') of the sixteenth century, and in the Percy Folio MS. (c. 1650). Basing his investigations on omissions and additions in the different versions, he first concludes that the four fifteenth-century texts all represent one version (*x*), and that each of the other texts is independent. Each of these versions, except P, Faust argues, represents a *modification* of a stage in a long line of development, starting with a form which is not extant and ending in the Percy Folio version; the last, however, 'has been contaminated by some member of the group that composes *x*'. In the second part of the monograph Faust discusses the sources of the narrative. He finds it to be a blend of three types of story: (i) the 'Sohrab and Rustem' type, the climax of which is a combat between a father and a son, who do not recognize each other; (ii) the 'jealous father' type, in which a father sets impossible tasks to his daughter's suitors; (iii) a type derived from the legend of St. Gregory, in which a man marries his (unrecognized) mother. From the details of these three stories almost all the details of *Sir Degare* can be accounted for.

Faust next compares *Sir Degare* with two related romances, *Richars li biaus* and the Dutch *Die Riddere metter Mouwen*,

¹³ *Sir Degare: A Study of the Texts and Narrative Structure*, by George Patterson Faust. Princeton and O. U. Presses. (Princeton Studies in English, xi.) pp. 99. 7s.

concluding that the former and the English romance are from a common original, which in its turn shares a common original with *Die Riddere*. Finally, the writer deals with the dragon-episode in *Sir Degare* (for which he can trace no exact source), and this and other supernatural elements such as the magic gloves he regards as 'a composite of odds and ends drawn from a late version of a *märchen* and from other romances'. He finds, however, 'nothing in the structure of the Tale to support the theory', which has been maintained by earlier writers, of Celtic origin. There are four short appendices, the most important of which is that in which is listed 'most of the evidence which can conceivably be held to oppose the stemma proposed' for the manuscript-history of the poem.

Two romances of the Charlemagne cycle, *Firumbras* and *Otuel and Roland*, have been edited from the Fillingham MS. (B.M. Addit. 37492) by M. I. O'Sullivan.¹⁴ The first comprises 1,842 lines in rhymed couplets, the second 2,786 lines in twelve-line stanzas with tail-rhyme. The introduction is mostly concerned with the relationships of these tales to other versions of the same romances in French and English. The editor concludes that the Fillingham *Firumbras* 'does not derive directly from any of the extant verse texts', though it 'exhibits special agreements' with all but one of them, and that it and the Bodleian *Sir Ferumbras* are from a common source. The differences between *Firumbras* and other versions may be due to its immediate (lost) French source, or to the imagination of the English translator. As for *Otuel and Roland*, it is probable that the Fillingham and Auchinleck versions of the first part (vv. 1–1691, down to the capture and baptism of Garcy) had a common English original, and that the second part (which includes the death of Roland) is probably derived from a French *Turpin*. The introduction, the arguments and arrangement of which are not always clear, is marred by an unusual number of obvious misprints, by serious confusion between sound and symbol in the section on phonology (e.g. 'O.E. stable *y* remains *y*', p. lxxv), and by the quite unnecessary representation of

¹⁴ *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, ed. by Mary Isabelle O'Sullivan. (E.E.T.S., 198.) O.U.P. pp. lxxxviii + 101. 18s.

O.E. *æ*, *ǣ* by *ae*, *āē*. There is a glossary, which might well have had etymological explanations, and also, by way of notes, some extracts from the Latin *Turpin's Chronicle* to illustrate the relation of *Otuel and Roland* (vv. 1692–2777) to this version.

We must pass over quickly a number of articles which deal with Arthurian matter from a general point of view rather than that of Middle English literature. O. G. S. Crawford has an article in *Antiquity* (Sept.) on *Arthur and his Battles*, which he believes to have been fought in the north, and perhaps to 'represent the opposition of the inhabitants of the Celtic zone . . . to attempts at penetration by Angles, Saxons and Frisians, or clashes between varying groups of Celts, Scots and Picts'.

Gordon Hall Gerould (*Speculum*, Oct.) in *Arthurian Romance and the Date of the Relief at Modena* argues against R. S. Loomis's views on the early date of the Arthurian carvings on the archivolt of the north portal of the cathedral at Modena. If, as Loomis believes, they are of the early twelfth century, they ante-date the period at which Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia* became well known, and we must look for another early source for the widespread dissemination of Arthurian stories. Gerould's arguments are too detailed to be given here, and we can only give his conclusion that the Porta della Pescheria 'seems unlikely . . . to have been finished with all its elaborate carvings before 1150 at the earliest'.

Jacob Hammer (*Speculum*, Jan.) prints and discusses an anonymous *Commentary on the Prophetia Merlini*, which is found in two manuscripts of the *Prophetia*: Bibl. Nationale, Fonds Latin 6233, and Fonds Latin 4126. In each case the commentary is marginal, and covers only part of the text. Both versions of the commentary are of the fourteenth century; the name of the scribe of the first is unknown; the second is the work of a York scribe, Robert of Populton or Popilton.

Gweneth Hutchings, in an article on *Gawain and the Abduction of Guenevere* (*Med. Aev.*, Feb.), prefers the theory of Arthur as the chief rescuer of Guenevere to that which would assign this role to Gawain.

In *Hakewill and the Arthurian Legend* George Williamson (*M.L.N.*, Nov.) quotes a passage from George Hakewill's

Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Gouernment of the World (1627), condemning the British legends of the Trojan Brutus and of Arthur as ‘unsound and unwarrantable’, ‘fabulous history’, and ‘ridiculous fictions’.

Elizabeth M. Wright gives an interesting series of notes on the text of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* in *P.M.L.A.* (Apr., July), chiefly on lexicographical points. The notes are introduced by some general considerations concerning the author and the matter of the poem. Just as the late Sir Israel Gollancz saw in the person of Gawain ‘some contemporary knight’, Mrs. Wright sees ‘our author in his lighter mood in the figure of the Green Knight, *the bolde burne pat be burȝ azte*, the courteous and hospitable host’, the country gentleman with a taste for amateur theatricals, who could delight in picturing himself masquerading as a monster in an ‘enterlude’, terrifying the audience by his violence and rage. Mrs. Wright finds this dramatic or mumming-play element especially marked in the scenes in Arthur’s hall, at the Green Chapel, and also in the scene (the significance of which she thinks is often missed) in which the guide assigned to Sir Gawain tries ‘to scare [him] beforehand by tales of ruthless murders committed by the giant he is about to meet’.

Angus Macdonald, in a note on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (*M.L.R.*, July), suggests that *wonder* in the phrase *werre and wrake and wonder* (v. 16) denotes ‘destruction’, quoting as a parallel the words from the Peterborough Chronicle, *þa diden hi alle wunder*, which Joseph Hall explained as ‘did dreadful deeds, destruction’, &c. (Cf. the note on this line in Mrs. Wright’s article referred to above.)

A Note on Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, l. 1700, by Henry Savage in *Med. & Ev.* (Oct.), deals with the word *traylez* in the line *Traylez ofte a trayteres bi traunt of her wyles*. This was glossed by Tolkien and Gordon in their edition of the poem as ‘to (follow a) trail’, postulating a use of the word in this sense about two hundred years before the date of any corresponding example given by the *O.E.D.* Savage shows by a number of quotations from Gunnar Tilander’s article on *OFr. traillier* (*Studia neophilologica*, i) that this French verb had a technical

sense when used as a hunting term, 'Chercher la bête par les chiens sans avoir aucune piste et sans avoir quêté auparavant par le limier', in fact, that of the modern English term 'to draw' (a covert, &c.). It is in this sense, and as derived from the OFr. *traillier*, that Savage would understand the verb in *Sir Gawain*. He follows Emerson in retaining *trayteres* (= traitoress, i.e. the vixen), and takes *bi traunt of her wyles* to allude to the tendency of a vixen to double back on her tracks to regain the covert, crossing and confusing the line of the hunt.

A. G. Hooper in *The Awntyrs off Arthure: Dialect and Authorship* (*Leeds Studies in English*, 4) aims at showing that this romance 'was not written originally in a Northwest Midland dialect but in a Northern one, and that marked differences in style make it improbable that one and the same man wrote' this poem, the *Pistill of Susan*, and the *Morte Arthure*, as had been suggested by S. O. Andrew (*R.E.S.*, v). Hooper takes into account all four manuscripts of the *Awntyrs*: Thornton, Douce, Ireland, and Lambeth (for which see *The Year's Work*, xv. 111). The evidence for the original dialect is not very extensive, but such as it is it supports his case. His arguments against common authorship of the three poems above mentioned are based mainly on the evidence of 'tags' and other phrases, of rhyme-forms, and of alliteration, and this evidence seems sufficient to establish his thesis.

J. L. N. O'Loughlin shows in *Med. Æv.* (Oct.) that in *The Middle English Alliterative 'Morte Arthure'* very many of the lines with 'faulty' alliteration (which have commonly been emended) occur in alliterative couplets, e.g. *We are comen fro þe kyng: of þis lythe ryche / That knawen is for conqueror: corownde in erthe*, 1653–4; further, many of these couplets form a syntactical unit. This theory eliminates the advisability of emendation in many lines. The second part of the article gives annotations of a number of individual passages, with suggestions for emendation, interpretation, and etymology.

This chapter chronicled last year (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 110–11) the discovery of a manuscript of Malory's *Morte Darthur*. A short study of this manuscript in its relation to

Caxton's print, with which it is contemporary, and to Malory's sources, has been published by E. Vinaver¹⁵ (in, and as a reprint from, the John Rylands Library Bulletin), as a foretaste of the edition of the Winchester MS. which he is preparing. He shows briefly by instances from the manuscript, Caxton, and the French sources that the two former have a common source intermediate between them and the last named; in this conclusion he agrees with Oakeshott (see *The Year's Work*, as above), though he doubts the validity of some of the latter's proofs. He discusses the methods to be followed in reconstructing the text as Malory wrote it, his own plan being to use the Winchester MS. as a basis (as the more complete), taking variant readings from C only when they are supported by the sources against the manuscript. On the whole character and purpose of the *Morte Darthur* he suggests that Malory was 'primarily concerned not with the telling of adventures, but with the glorification of Knighthood as an institution', and that the alterations he made in his sources were made with this end in view. Malory's interest was political rather than romantic. His intention is seen better in the manuscript than in the edition of Caxton, who considerably shortened many of the Arthurian episodes. The moral purpose which has also been traced in the *Morte Darthur* has been difficult to relate to the character of the author, if we may identify him with the 'Lancastrian knight and burglar' of whom records are extant, and who was several times imprisoned for various offences. Vinaver thinks it possible that the writing of the book was undertaken by a penitent Malory 'to redeem his offences', and points out that a phrase at the conclusion of the Winchester MS., 'by a knyght prisoner Sir Thomas Malleorre', supports the identification of the writer with the robber.

In an article in *M.L.R.* (Apr.) George R. Stewart suggests that the *English Geography in Malory's 'Morte D'Arthur'* is less vague and 'fanciful' than has sometimes been supposed. Malory gives many more indications of place than are to be found in any of the earlier romances; some of these topographical indications may be derived from lost sources, some

¹⁵ *Malory's Morte Darthur in the Light of a Recent Discovery*, by Eugène Vinaver. Manchester Univ. Press. pp. 21. 1s. 6d.

may depend on Malory himself. Stewart gives possible and interesting explanations for some of Malory's geographical identifications and references.

Next we deal with Middle English chronicles, beginning with Lazamon's *Brut*. A monograph entitled *Lazamon: An Attempt at Vindication*¹⁶ comes to us from Holland. (The purpose of the sub-title is not clear.) Writing on Lazamon's sources, Visser contends that the poet 'made no use of any Latin works, except to some extent of Geoffrey's Historia', and gives, to show the influence of Geoffrey, a number of parallel passages which are not entirely convincing, though the theory is certainly a possible one. Further, he believes that Lazamon was not unacquainted with Welsh oral tradition, from which he introduced stories and names into his epic. He disagrees with the theory advanced by R. Imelmann (1905) that a Norman chronicle based on a fusion of Wace and Gaimar was the main source of the *Brut*. He agrees with the now usual opinion that Lazamon is essentially an original and skilful poet, and that the whole spirit of his poem is thoroughly Anglo-Saxon in character and tradition.

Edward Zettl has produced a good edition of the so-called *Short Metrical Chronicle*.¹⁷ This text is extant in five manuscripts: Royal 12 c. xii (R), 1320–40; MS. Auchinleck (A), 1330–40; B.M. Addit. MS. 19677 (B), 1390–1400; Univ. Libr. Cambridge Dd. xiv. 2 (D), before 1432; Univ. Libr. Cambridge Ff. v. 48 (F), fifteenth century. There are also two fragments: Bodl. Rawl. poet. 145 (H) and B.M. Cot. Calig. A. xi (C), and an Anglo-Norman translation in Univ. Libr. Cambridge Gg. i. 1 (G). The relations between these versions are examined, and Zettl finds that R is nearest to the original (O), F derived from a modification (*x*) of O, while the others stand at various removes from a modification of *x*. The present text is based on B, which has not previously been printed. Footnotes give

¹⁶ *Lazamon: An Attempt at Vindication*, by G. J. Visser. Assen: Van Gorcum. pp. 100. f. 2.90.

¹⁷ *An Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle*, ed. from the manuscripts with Introduction and Glossary by E. Zettl. (E.E.T.S., 196.) O.U.P. pp. cxxxvi+163. 20s.

variant readings from other manuscripts. Part II gives 'all those passages . . . which do not exist at all in B or which differ substantially from the corresponding ones in that manuscript'; in Part III the Anglo-Norman version is printed in full.

The original version of the chronicle consisted of a straightforward, comparatively bald account of the course of English history (actual and legendary) from the coming of Brutus to the beginning of the reign of Edward II, told in rhymed couplets. It was probably written 'for the instruction of the little-educated parts of the community'. Various redactors added to the original matter, in some cases extending the period covered, and in one version the original 900 or so lines were increased to over 2,000. The sources of the Chronicle are not easy to determine, but the original writer seems at least to have been acquainted with the *Rhymed Chronicle* of Robert of Gloucester, and some of the detail 'may ultimately go back to the *Gesta Regum* of William of Malmesbury, to Layamon B, or to Geoffrey of Monmouth'. The number of redactions shows that the poem was comparatively popular for some time. The literary value of the Chronicle is less than its historical or linguistic value. The editor has examined in detail the phonology of each of the different versions. From the rhymes which appear to derive from the original text he concludes that the poem was first written in South or South-east Warwickshire. The Introduction includes a long discussion of the differences in the several versions, the text being divided for this purpose into short sections. The volume ends with a glossary and index of proper names.

The popular chronicle of the fifteenth century is the theme of a monograph by F.-J. Starke.¹⁸ After a brief introduction in which he sketches the state of literature in the fifteenth century, and stresses the importance at that time of middle-class society, as distinct from the Court, the nobility, and the Church, not only as a reading public but in increasing measure as a writing

¹⁸ *Populäre englische Chroniken des 15. Jahrhunderts: Eine Untersuchung über ihre literarische Form*, by Fritz-Joachim Starke. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, 51.) Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt. pp. 174. RM. 7.50.

public, he devotes the first two chapters to a short critical survey of the historical work produced by English clerics from the period of the early 'Easter tables'. The medieval Latin chronicle may be considered as having two sides, the annalistic and the biographical, of which the second has the greater claim to literary status. On the whole the subject-matter of the monastic and episcopal chronicles is of practical, material interest; their character is temporal rather than spiritual; but in spite of their many faults they did attain to some importance both linguistically, 'da hier ein Idiom geschaffen wurde, das die Verständigung des gesamten Abendlandes ermöglichte', and even as literature. In the monasteries creative activity seems to have come to an end with some suddenness at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and at this time, too, the biographies of bishops and other dignitaries diminish seriously in length and quality. At this time, however, two types of secular chronicle rise in importance: the chronicles of London, and the fifteenth-century prose *Brut* with its prototypes. This was the first great period of the London citizens, and their pride in themselves and their city was in part expressed in written narratives and memoirs, usually anonymous. After giving a list of the chief documents of this kind (e.g. Fabian's Chronicle, Gregory's Chronicle, the Great Chronicle, &c.), Starke proceeds to give an account of the general character of their contents, and suggests that their greatest importance lies in the information they afford about the lives and interests of the ordinary citizen. Any literary quality that is to be found in them is for the most part in the descriptions of individual episodes, not in any general feeling for form or style.

The fourth chapter is devoted to 'das wichtigste historische Buch des 15. Jahrhunderts', *The Brut* or *Chronicles of England*; this was printed by Caxton (under the latter title) in 1480, and in addition to the thirteen editions which appeared between that date and 1528, a large number of contemporary manuscripts are still extant. This work gives an account of the history of Britain down to 1461, beginning, like its Middle English prototypes, with the advent of the Trojan Brutus to this country, and drawing the history of the earliest times ultimately from Nennius and Geoffrey of Monmouth. The literary worth

of the *Brut*, in spite of the fact that much of it is a compilation from earlier works, is not inconsiderable, and various points of its style are discussed by Starke at some length. The volume ends with an appendix on the verse-passages found in the *Brut*, another on later continuations of the *Brut*, and a bibliography.

A survey of the work done this year on other Middle English prose may well begin with the *Ancren Riwle*. In a letter on *The Torkington Chartulary* (*T.L.S.*, Feb. 14) H. E. Allen proposes to identify the three recluses for whom the *Riwle* was written (and whom she had, as is well known, identified with the three *puellae* to whom the Abbot of Westminster gave the hermitage of Kilburn in the reign of Henry I) with the three unmarried daughters of a certain Deorman of London; these three, with their brother Ordgar, according to a writ of Henry I, gave land in London to Westminster Abbey in return for fraternity in the Abbey. Miss Allen would further identify this Deorman, an Anglo-Saxon thane of William the Conqueror, with the Deorman who appears prominently in the Hertfordshire Doomsday.

Miss Allen expands this suggestion in an article in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) on *The Three Daughters of Deorman*. The name of Orgarus filius Deremanni is found elsewhere in London records as that of a member of the *Cnihtengild*, and two other 'sons of Deorman', Algar and Tierr, are also known. Tierr became Deorman's heir, and if he was really the brother of the three recluses he is important as linking them with a leading Norman family, since his wife was a Clare. The work which Miss Allen is doing on the provenance of the extant manuscripts of the *Riwle* 'has brought out the extraordinary persistence of court connexions with this English treatise'. Miss Allen does not press her proposed identification unduly, and as she says, since Deorman seems to have died in 1093–7, 'only on the supposition that daughters of his were infants at his death could . . . they have been the persons for whom the *Ancren Riwle* was written'.

A short article on *Proverbs in the 'Ancren Riwle' and the 'Recluse'* by B. J. Whiting (*M.L.R.*, Oct.) supplements an earlier article on the proverbs of the *Riwle* by D. V. Ives, which was incomplete, and shows how the fourteenth-century adaptor,

in the *Recluse*, retained, omitted, or added to the proverb material of the *Riwle*.

The only other article on the *Ancren Riwle* is Vincent McNabb's *The Authorship of the Ancren Riwle* (*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, Rome, iv), which the present writer has not seen.

In *The Connection of the Katherine Group with Old English Prose* (J.E.G.P., Oct.) Dorothy Bethurum compares the style of *St. Margaret*, *St. Juliana*, and *St. Katherine* with that of Ælfric's *Saints' Lives*, and comes to the conclusion that the influence of the latter was outstanding in the development of the style of the Katherine Group. The rhythm of the latter 'is a fairly successful copy' of that of the Old English writer, and the use of alliteration, though different in some respects, approaches that of Ælfric. The alliteration in the three Middle English pieces is less skilful and subtle, and the free use of alliterative phrases and tags resembles the practice of Wulfstan and others rather than that of Ælfric. Miss Bethurum, on the other hand, finds no resemblance to, or influence of the Latin style on that of the Katherine Group.

The first part of this article points out briefly some distinctions in style between the texts of the Katherine Group and others associated with them, the *Ancren Riwle*, *Sawles Warde*, and *Hali Meidenhad*, all of which are lacking in the well defined rhythm and the regular use of alliteration which are such marked features of the style of the three saints' lives.

In an article on *The Provenance of the Lambeth Homilies with a New Collation* (Leeds Studies in English, 4), R. M. Wilson argues against the ascription of this text to Middlesex. He shows the resemblance between the dialectal features of MS. Lambeth 487 and those of the Katherine Group, but hardly succeeds in proving definitely that the complex of features shown in the former cannot be from Middlesex. A good deal depends on the attitude one takes towards the variant forms of the manuscript (and there are many of them), and the extent to which they are explained away. It is curious, but by no means impossible, that the dialects of two unconnected South Midland areas should be very similar at this early date.

It is useful to have a new collation of the printed text with the manuscript, even though 'no serious errors have been found'.

On an individual point of phonology we may include here a note by the same writer on $\bar{æ}^1$ and $\bar{æ}^2$ in *Middle English* (*Proc. of Leeds Philos. and Lit. Soc.* III. vi), in which he indicates the advisability of a re-examination of the evidence relating to the development of these vowels, especially in regard to rhymes and shortened forms.

The West Midland tract *Lincolniensis* (MS. Bodl. 647), now attributed to Nicholas Hereford, contains a reference to *Mauris & his felowes*. *Mauris* has usually been identified with St. Maurus, the first disciple of St. Benedict, but Bruce Dickins shows (*Proc. of Leeds Philos. and Lit. Soc.* IV. ii) that the reference is to St. Maurice *cum sociis suis*, martyred under Maximian, in the fourth century, and adds notes on the legend of St. Maurice.

In a note in *R.E.S.* (Apr.) Constance Davies refers to a version of the story of *The Revelation of the Monk of Evesham* in Ralph of Coggeshall's *Chronicum Anglicum*, which supports the theory of an early manuscript version, perhaps from the late twelfth century, to which period (1196) the revelation is assigned. Ralph of Coggeshall disagrees with William de Machlinia and Roger de Wendover in referring the monk to Eynsham ('in Enigsamensi coenobio'), not Evesham. Miss Davies believes this to be a mistake on the part of Ralph or a scribe.

Sir E. K. Chambers, however, points out (*ibid.*, July) that 'the Latin Vision of the Monk of Eynsham or Enesham, not Evesham, exists in a score or more of manuscripts', and has been edited more than once.

A Second MS. of Wyclif's 'De Dominio Civili' is reported by W. Peters Reeves (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) to be extant in MS. Bibliothèque Nationale 15869, bound up with a manuscript of the *Defensor Pacis* of Marsiglio of Padua. The *De Dominio Civili* has previously been known only from the Vienna MS. (ed. by R. L. Poole, 1884).

A. Pirkhofer in *Zum syntaktischen Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels bei Caxton* (*Eng. Stud.*, Apr.) gives material illustrating the use, or omission, of the definite article in sixteen types of

phrase, e.g. with words denoting measure, before numerals, before the vocative, before proper nouns, &c.

There is a fair amount of work to report this year on the medieval play.

W. W. Greg's edition of the Peniarth and Devonshire texts of the play of *Antichrist*,¹⁹ forms part of his plan 'to ascertain the textual history of the Chester cycle of mystery plays, and the principles that should guide an editor in attempting to reconstruct its original form'. The pageant of *Antichrist* is an important one in the cycle, since it is extant not only in the five cyclic manuscripts, but also (alone) in another and much earlier manuscript. The present study deals with textual and not recensional variations, but it is clear 'that the recension current at the end of the fifteenth century must have been substantially different from those with which we are familiar a hundred years later'.

After a brief note on the legend of *Antichrist*, and an explanation of the scope of the present work, the editor describes in detail the six manuscripts of the pageant: Devonshire (D, 1591), B.M. Addit. 10305 (W, 1592), Harley 2013 (R, 1600), Bodl. 175 (B, 1604), Harley 2124 (H, 1607), and, the separate MS., Peniarth 399 (P, c. 1500) in the Hengwrt-Peniarth collection, now in the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth. The last is written on two quires of vellum, one of four and one of six leaves, which have been folded down the middle; this folding 'may be due to the book having been carried in the pocket, and the rubbed and faded condition of the writing suggests much handling. One is tempted to suppose that we have here an actual prompt-book used in the production of the play.' The manuscript has unfortunately been largely retouched, even rewritten, by a modern 'restorer'.

In this edition the P and D texts are printed on opposite pages; footnotes record difficulties and interesting palaeographical points, all important variant readings in the other manuscripts, and a more minute record of the differences between P and H, the manuscript which P most nearly re-

¹⁹ *The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle*, ed. by W. W. Greg. O.U.P. pp. c+90. 10s.

sembles. The method of collation follows the principles laid down in Greg's *Calculus of Variants* (1927). A full analysis of the variants is given, with the object of determining the normal grouping of the manuscripts and their individual relationships. We cannot do more here than indicate the conclusions which the editor draws from his material. These are, in brief: all the manuscripts, with the possible exception of P, are collateral; apart from P, none can be the ancestor of any other; P is not the immediate parent of any other; the groups PHB and DWR are normal, B and D being intermediate between PH on the one hand and WR on the other; the six extant manuscripts are derived through a series of hypothetical manuscripts from a common archetype, which, however, 'was already by no means correct, and cannot be supposed original'.

The introduction ends with an important section on the relative value of the individual manuscripts for editorial purposes, leading to the choice of D among the cyclic manuscripts. The text then follows, and the volume ends with notes whose object is 'to elucidate the relationship of the manuscripts' rather than to explain the text, and an index to words discussed in the notes or introduction.

The Malone Society devotes one of its volumes for 1935 to a new text of another of the Chester plays and a number of smaller contributions to the history of the cycle.²⁰

F. M. Salter found at Chester, in an Enrolment Book (1597–1776) of the Coopers' Company, 'a copy of the Sixteenth Play of the Chester series, dealing with the Flagellation of Christ', copied into the book 'on the 22th day of August 1599' by George Bellin, who was also responsible for two manuscripts of the cycle (B.M. Addit. 10305, and Harley 2013), and was scribe to the Coopers' Company for nearly thirty years. Salter shows from a document of 1422, preserved among the loose papers of the Guild, that even then the plays of the Flagellation and the Crucifixion were distinct and did not form a unit as they do in MS. Harley 2124. He believes that so far from the single-

²⁰ *The Trial and Flagellation, with other studies in the Chester Cycle*, by F. M. Salter and W. W. Greg. O.U.P. for the Malone Society. pp. 171.

play form in H being a relic of an old tradition, the joining of the two was due to the depressed state of the Ironmongers' Company (who produced the 'Crucifixion') in the sixteenth century, and therefore that Harley 2124 represents a new development and not, as has been thought, the oldest form of the cycle. Salter gives a series of extracts from the Coopers' records, illustrating the history of the play, and other items from the Ironmongers' records of 1606-7. He then proposes a new genealogical scheme for the manuscripts of the cycle, disagreeing with that suggested by W. W. Greg. This argument is opposed by Greg in 'Remarks on the Relation of the Manuscripts', printed as an appendix to the *Trial*. The text of the *Trial*, with variant readings, follows.

The next item in this volume of the Malone Society publications is a description and the text of 'The Manchester Fragment of the Resurrection', part of a single leaf, containing vv. 1-13, 21-41, preserved in the Manchester Free Library. This is followed by an essay on 'Christ and the Doctors and the York Play'. In both these items Greg continues his studies in the manuscript history of the cycle. The last item contains 'The Lists and Banns of the Plays' printed from manuscripts in the Randle Holme collection, including a list of the crafts of Chester, from c. 1500, now for the first time published.

Mendal G. Frampton (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) reconsiders the question of *The Date of the 'Wakefield Master'*, whose work has been placed in various periods from the early fourteenth century to the reign of Edward IV. Frampton deals first with costume, and here produces two new readings from the manuscript of *Judicium* in the well-known passage *She is hornyd like a kowe, / a new fon syn, / The culer hyngys so side now, / furrid with a cat skyn*. In this the words *a new* have now been recovered with the help of the violet-ray, and *culer* 'collar', which is clear in the manuscript, replaces *cuker*, as it has formerly been transcribed. A detailed investigation of this and other 'costume passages' in those plays or parts of plays which are considered to be genuinely the work of the 'Wakefield master' leads Frampton to the conclusion that this poet 'was not writing before the second quarter of the fifteenth century'. Then, after

restating and amplifying the arguments for believing that the Towneley MS. is a register of Wakefield guild-plays, and 'that the cycle . . . must have been in much its present form when the Master completed his work upon the plays', Frampton asks, 'When was Wakefield and its vicinity able to sponsor our elaborate cycle of mystery plays', involving no less than 224 rôles? He finds an answer to this in the poll-tax records; in the year 1379 the village of Wakefield had a total adult population of 315. (The towns of Beverley, Newcastle, and Coventry within a year or two of this date had adult populations respectively of 2,663, 2,647, and about 7,000.) The same records also indicate that Wakefield at that time was far too poor to be able to finance a large cycle of plays, even assuming that the (equally poor) countryside helped. By 1553 Wakefield is said to have been the largest and most flourishing town in the district, but this leaves a large gap. Frampton argues against Gayley's dating of 1375–1400, and Pollard's of 1400–15. There seems to be some reason for supposing that during the reign of Henry VI it was growing larger and more prosperous, and this corroborates the arguments from costume advanced earlier in this article. Some bibliographical evidence, briefly dealt with in the final paragraphs, point to the same conclusion.

Some Textual Notes based on Examination of the Towneley Manuscript are supplied by Margaret Trusler (*P.Q.*, Oct.), who has 'made a special point of examining all passages involving irregular or obscure rime-words, as well as those passages already cited in previous textual criticism'. Miss Trusler comments altogether on thirty-one forms.

Some *Analogues to the Mak Story* have been contributed to the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* (Oct.–Dec., 1934) by H. M. Smyser and T. B. Stroup.

R. Withington has a note on *Water fastand* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) in *Secunda Pastorum* 352. The word *water* was explained by Strunk (*M.L.N.*, 1930) as equivalent to *walter*, 'roll, toss', and Withington points out that *water* is probably a phonetic spelling indicating the loss of *l* before *t*.

In *M.L.R.* (Apr.) Anna J. Mill publishes an interesting series of craft-accounts dealing with the Bakers' Corpus Christi

pageant, from 1543 to 1580. They show that the Corpus Christi play was regularly performed by the bakers, alone or with the help of the water-leaders or others, over a considerable number of years (plague-years excepted), even through the reign of Mary. There is a gap in the accounts from 1557 to 1563, but there is evidence from minutes in other records of the Guild that the play was given at least occasionally during this time. 'On three occasions only after this, 1567, 1569, 158-, have we any evidence that the bakers gave their play of the Last Supper; and, by then, to judge from the sparse expenditure, the play was shorn of its glory.'

Miss Mill shows what can be gathered from the accounts as to the episodes of the play, and the properties required therein (e.g. 'ffor mendyng the lam & payntyng off the dyadems'), the catering for the actors' meals, and repairs for the pageant house and pageant car.

Two notes on Morality Plays appear in *P.Q.* (July). One, by Robert Withington, proposes to emend *pley* in *The Castle of Perseverance*, Line 695 to *prey* 'as more correctly representing the speaker's attitude towards mankind'.

Norman E. Eliason makes a new suggestion as to the meaning of *lappe* in the line '*I take my cap in my lappe*' (*Everyman*, 801). He relates it to various Germanic words with the senses of 'paw, blade of an oar, sole of a foot, flat hand, large or coarse hand', and so forth, e.g. Scand. *labb*, Norw. *lamp*, *lappe*, Icel. *loppa*, and he gives other instances in Middle or Early Modern English in which *lap(pe)* may well be understood as 'hand'.

Finally, this chapter must include a number of publications of less importance to literary history. The first few are on the subject of manners and social training in medieval England.

Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son*²¹ has now been edited in full for the first time. This long poem, of more than 7,500 lines, is less a literary achievement than an interesting reflection of the social life of the fifteenth century—'a faithful expression of the middle-class culture of [Idley's] day'. The author's name

²¹ Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son*, edited by Charlotte D'Evelyn. (Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America, Monograph Series, vi.) Boston: Heath; London: Milford. pp. 240.

is given by himself in a Latin preface (omitted from some of the seven manuscripts) as *Petrus Idle armiger*, and since he remarks in Book II, in reference to his 'symply' English, 'I was born in Kent', he has usually been referred to hitherto as 'Peter Idle of Kent'. In a long and interesting introduction Miss D'Evelyn gives reasons for assuming that the reference to Kent is merely a proverbial expression equivalent to 'I am no polished writer', and proceeds to identify Peter with Peter Idley of Oxfordshire, a public official whose life can be traced in some detail. He was Bailiff of the Honour of Wallingford, then gentleman falconer and underkeeper of the royal mews and falcons, and finally Controller of the King's Work. He was thus in contact with both court and country life, and his earlier work as well as his home at Drayton in Oxfordshire brought him into the circle of the Stonors, Redes, Harcourts, Marmyons, and other 'good fifteenth-century company'.

The *Instructions* are divided into two books, the first based on two Latin works by the thirteenth-century writer Albertanus of Brescia: *Liber Consolationis et Consilii* and *Liber de Amore et Dilectione Dei et Proximi*. Idley's work has little unity or real coherence, but is rather 'a collection of instructions on miscellaneous topics . . . not specifically religious instruction . . . but wisdom of a social and moral kind, intended to put Thomas Idley on his guard against the world, rather than the flesh and the devil'. The second book is based on Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*, with some additions from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*. Idley treats his sources with some freedom, adding, adapting, omitting, and rearranging, but without great skill or originality. The date of composition lies probably between 1445 and 1450. There are seven manuscripts known, six of the fifteenth, one of the sixteenth century, but only three contain both Books. Miss D'Evelyn's volume includes a brief account of the dialect of the poem, notes on the text, and an index of the persons, places, and books mentioned in the introduction.

Some further suggestions concerning *Peter Idley*, and the family of Drayton into which he married, are made in a letter to *T.L.S.* (Sept. 12) by E. St. John Brooks.

Mary Theresa Brentano's monograph on medieval courtesy-

poems²² sketches the early history of the literature of good manners in Europe and the East down to the appearance in the twelfth century of a Latin poem with the title *Doctrina magistri Joannis Faceti*, which was in fact a supplement to the popular *Distichs of Cato*, and which was destined to be a model for many future writings in Latin and in the vernaculars of western Europe. These works have much similarity in subject-matter; they are concerned with conversation, personal appearance, social manners, and especially the etiquette of the table; they were usually designed for the schoolboy or the young page. The chief Middle English documents of this type are (a) two fifteenth-century poems with the title *Stans Puer ad Mensam*, from a Latin poem of the same name; (b) the *Boke of Curtasye* (c. 1460); (c) *Vrbanitatis* (c. 1460); (d) the *Babees Book* (c. 1475); (e) the *Lytelle Childrenes Lytil Boke* (c. 1480); (f) Caxton's *Book of Curtesye* (c. 1477, written by a pupil of Lydgate); (g) the *Young Children's Book* (c. 1500); (h) Symon's *Lesson of Wysedome for all Maner Chyldrym* (? c. 1500); (i) Rhodes's *Boke of Nurture* (c. 1530). An account is given of the matter of these writings, and of similar Latin works produced in this country. A bibliography is provided.

Iris Brooke continues her series of books on English costume with one on the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,²³ which will be of value to students of the literature of the period. Each opening shows a page of illustrations (some in colour) and a page of descriptive matter. The author quotes freely from Chaucer, the Paston Letters, &c., so that pictures and text illustrate each other. The drawings are, of course, based on contemporary illustrations in manuscripts, &c.

Sanford Brown Meech has now found and published four treatises on Latin grammar in fifteenth-century English. These are of importance as making it clear that 'borrowing of the concepts of Latin Grammar into English was common in the

²² *Relationship of the Latin Facetus Literature to the Medieval English Courtesy Poems*, by Mary Theresa Brentano. (Univ. of Kansas Humanistic Studies, v. ii.) pp. 133. \$1.00.

²³ *English Costumes of the Later Middle Ages*, drawn and described by Iris Brooke. A. and C. Black. pp. 87. 6s.

fifteenth century, more than a hundred years before the earliest English grammars', and this borrowing began in the equation of Latin inflexions and constructions with English ones for the sake of illustration, and the consequent application to English of the formal categories of Latin. One of these four treatises appeared in 1934 (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 136–7). Two are printed in an article entitled *Early Application of Latin Grammar to English* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.), from MS. Douce 103 and St. John's College Cambridge 163. These, like the others, are modelled on the *Donet*, or *Ars Minor* of Donatus, but differ from it considerably in detail. Both are in the form of question and answer, and deal one by one with the eight Latin parts of speech. The editor compares the four treatises in this article, adding some notes on their resemblances to the works of later grammarians; he also points out their lexicographical importance, and lists the grammatical terms employed in them.

The grammar of the Trinity College MS., edited under the title *An Early Treatise in English concerning Latin Grammar (Essays and Studies in English and Comp. Lit.)*, Univ. of Michigan, xiii) is a more extensive work, including material on Latin inflexion and syntax. It is in a manuscript which once belonged, as is shown by internal evidence, to the College of Magdalene at Battlefield, near Shrewsbury. The language of the English portions of the manuscript shows a number of marked dialectal features, which clearly distinguish it from the speech of London, and support the view that both the grammar and this copy of it were products of Shropshire.

S. B. Meech has also edited (*Speculum*, July) the three English musical treatises out of the collection of twenty in English and Latin in the fifteenth-century MS. Lansdowne 763. The scribe of the whole volume was John Wylde, a precentor of the Augustinian Abbey at Waltham Holy Cross in Essex. The first of the English pieces is by Lionel Power, a composer of repute of the early fifteenth century; the second is anonymous; the author of the third bears the name of Chilston, but has not been otherwise identified. The interest of these works is mainly technical; they give 'detailed and explicit information concerning musical theory and practice in England of the fifteenth century'. But

the text also possesses some linguistic interest. In two points (the predominating *e* for OE. *y* and the occurrence of *-th* plurals by the side of *-(n)* forms) the dialect is distinguished from the contemporary Literary Standard. Moreover, they contain a number of words and special senses not recorded in the *O.E.D.* before the sixteenth century.

In *Speculum* (Oct.) Donald Drew Egbert gives a very full description of *The 'Tewkesbury' Psalter* and its contents, with three facsimile pages. This manuscript, which is 'a good example of typical English Gothic illumination of the third quarter of the thirteenth century', was probably written for the unknown woman whose portrait appears within the initial letter of one of the Canticles. A series of obits added in the fifteenth century connects the manuscript with the important families of Beauchamp, Despenser, and Neville, and with the Benedictine Abbey of Tewkesbury. It is possible that the original owner was an ancestress of the Johanna Beauchamp, Lady Abergavenny (daughter of the Earl of Arundel), whose obit is the first in the volume. The manuscript is now in the library of Mr. Robert Garrett of Baltimore.

VI

THE RENAISSANCE

By F. S. BOAS

AMONG the 1935 publications with which this chapter is concerned, precedence in the present year may appropriately be given to an account of the coronation of a Queen Consort Elizabeth. From a manuscript now in his possession George Smith has printed *The Coronation of Elizabeth Wydeville*.¹ This is the only known contemporary source describing the ceremony in Westminster Abbey and the banquet that followed in Westminster Hall. A facsimile is given of the first page of the MS., which is written upon six leaves of paper bearing a watermark also found in paper on which some of the Paston letters are written.

In his introduction Smith draws attention to some special points. As the Duke of Buckingham was only nine years of age he could not act as hereditary Constable, so the Earl of Arundel discharged the dual offices of Constable and Butler. As the Bishopric of Bath was vacant, the Bishop of Salisbury walked on one side of the Queen, and on the other, according to custom, the Bishop of Durham, though he had been suspended as a Lancastrian supporter. The Earl of Oxford, as has not been otherwise known, acted as Chamberlain. The assemblage at the Coronation, as Smith observes, 'provided a true mirror of the King's policy to be the ruler of a nation rather than of a party, for it was certainly a gathering in which the more moderate elements of the country had adequate representation.' The editor adds helpful notes on all the personages taking part in the ceremony, together with indexes and a bibliography.

The career of Elizabeth's brother, Anthony Wydeville, is sketched by Rudolf Hittmair in *Earl Rivers' Einleitung zu einer Übertragung der 'Weisheitsprüche der Philosophen'* (*Anglia*,

¹ *The Coronation of Elizabeth Wydeville, Queen Consort of Edward IV, on May 26th 1465: A contemporary account now first set forth from a fifteenth-century manuscript by George Smith.* Ellis. pp. 88. 6s.

lix. 328 ff.). After this biography he prints the Introduction to Rivers's *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*, printed by Caxton in 1477. Hittmair takes the different sections of the Introduction *seriatim*, with a running commentary, including an account of Jehan de Teonville, provost of Paris, whose French version of a Latin original was used by Rivers. The question of whether Rivers knew this version in print or in manuscript is also discussed.

R. Weiss prints in full for the first time *A Letter-Preface of John Free to John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester* (*B.Q.R.*, viii, no. 87). It is the preface to Free's Latin version of Bishop Synesius's *Laus Calviti*, which he dedicated and presented to Tiptoft on the occasion of the latter's return from Italy to England in 1461. Reiss gives reasons for concluding that MS. Bodl. 80 is the copy given to Tiptoft. The Latin preface is in the customary vein of high-flown adulation. But it contains two points of biographical interest. It is the only contemporary document that tells that Pope Pius II was moved to tears by Tiptoft's eloquence, and compared him with the most illustrious of classical worthies. It also confirms the statement of his Italian biographer, Vespasiano da Bisticci, that he set out on his long travels because he did not wish to be involved in the factions of the civil wars.

As 1935 was the 400th anniversary of the death of Sir Thomas More, it has naturally marked the high tide of the flood of publications concerning him which have been noticed during recent years in this annual survey. And here precedence must be given to R. W. Chambers's volume, *Thomas More*.² As he tells us in his preface, he has brooded over his subject for some thirty years. Several of his publications dealing with some aspect of it have been noticed previously in *The Year's Work*, (xi. 128-9, xiii. 18-20, 131-2). In the present study he has summed up the results of his long and devoted labours. By his mastery of his materials, his breadth of vision, and his distinction of style he has won all the suffrages—even of those who would not endorse all his views of More's part in affairs of church and state.

² *Thomas More*, by R. W. Chambers. Cape. pp. 416. 12s. 6d.

But these concern us less here than the sections of his book in which Chambers deals with More as a scholar and writer. Thus we have, at his bidding, to give up the picture of 'the Oxford Reformers', with Grocyn, Linacre, Colet, and young Thomas studying Greek together, and to realize that it was later in London that they became close friends. The analysis of what exactly 'humanism' meant to them, and especially to More, is penetrating. So also is the discussion of the relations of Erasmus and More, the pacifist and the patriot, with their temperamental differences, yet linked in friendship and love of letters.

There is a glowing picture of England in the early years of Henry VIII's reign, deficient in painting and sculpture but rich in 'magnificent architecture, craftsmanship, and scholarship', with poetry reviving and native prose entering into its own. And it is in relation to its own day, as Chambers insists, that More's most widely known work must be considered:

'*Utopia* is, in part, a protest against the New Statesmanship: against the new idea of the autocratic prince, to whom everything is allowed. . . . Again *Utopia* is, in part, a protest against the New Economics: the enclosures of the great landowners, breaking down old law and custom, destroying the old common-field agriculture. . . . Parts of *Utopia* read like a commentary on parts of *The Prince*; . . . before *The Prince* was written, ideas used in *The Prince* had been gaining ground. They were the "progressive" ideas, and we may regard *Utopia* as a "reaction" against them.'

Every one will not look at *Utopia* from exactly the same angle as Chambers, but he makes it clear that, like Machiavelli's treatise, it is 'a work of our common Western European civilization', published in Latin in six continental cities before its publication in More's own country, and translated into German, Italian, and French before the English version of 1551. To the Paris edition the French scholar Budé contributed an introduction; together with Vives and Cranevelt he forms one of the group of More's later continental humanist friends. It is as a great European that More is presented by Chambers and as the leading figure of the last pre-Reformation period. Links are traced between him and Langland on the one hand, and Swift and Burke on the other. And the summing-up is that

'More . . . has affinities with many English writers, mediaeval and modern; but his closest links are with the men of the Middle Ages, and with those moderns who have striven to preserve something of the legacy of the Middle Ages—first and foremost, the conception of the unity of Civilization'. Many of the issues discussed by Chambers would have been beyond the ken of More's early biographers, but they will doubtless have welcomed this brilliant latter-day recruit to their brotherhood.

Among those biographers the most familiar is William Roper, whose *Lyfe* of his father-in-law³ has been edited by Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock with the same zeal and scholarship as she had previously bestowed upon Harpsfield's *Life* (see *The Year's Work*, xiii. 129–32). For her edition Miss Hitchcock has collated thirteen manuscripts, of which six are in the British Museum. Among these MS. Harleian 6254 has been taken as the basis of her critical text, with the variants in the other manuscripts recorded fully in the footnotes, though these variants, as Miss Hitchcock states, are not of much significance. She also gives an account of the previous printed editions, from that by 'T. P.' in 1626 to George Sampson's in 1910.

The historical notes to this edition are mainly summarized from the notes to Harpsfield's *Life*, but on certain points there is additional and new matter. The introduction includes a biography of Roper. It throws fresh light on the date of his birth, his connexion with Lincoln's Inn and St. John's College, Oxford, of which he was a Visitor, and his lawsuit with Dame Alice More. Miss Hitchcock mentions some of Roper's omissions and errors, but concludes that 'for all the More Lives, Roper's ranks as the *biographia princeps*, and has always been recognized as one of the masterpieces of English literature'.

Published in 1934, and reissued in 1936, Daniel Sargent's *Thomas More*⁴ may be noticed in connexion with the anniversary year biographies. It contains no documentary references and

³ *The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, Knight*, written by William Roper, Esquire; ed. by Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock. O.U.P. for E.E.T.S. pp. li+142. 10s.

⁴ *Thomas More*, by Daniel Sargent. Sheed and Ward. pp. 299. 5s.

will appeal to the general reader rather than to the student. But it is a spirited and attractively written piece of work. In slighter fashion it presents More in something of the same light as does Chambers. It stresses the point that 'More's most remarkable literary talent was dramatic; an ability to invent dialogue. . . . With that ability he was later to illustrate his controversial writings, and make his conversation as good as a play.' It takes a similar view of the attitude of *Utopia* to the new statesmanship. 'There had been talk in the *Utopia* about princes . . . far, far away, who thought they were a law to themselves. It was wiser to refer to them as far away when they happened to be so near. They were a new type of king: they were everywhere; and More feared what their wilfulness might do.' And as the dominant quality of More's life and writings Sargent picks out 'sociability'. For the exact sense in which he uses the term, and for its illustration, reference must be made to his book, where he also defends Sir Thomas against charges of inconsistency.

Another well-written biography of a popular type is Sir John R. O'Connell's *Saint Thomas More*.⁵ Sir John, before his ordination, was a practising lawyer, and he deals effectively with the legal aspects of More's career, as Under-Sheriff of London, Judge of the Court of Requests, and Lord Chancellor. He emphasizes More's connexion with the City of London, and his English characteristics, including his love of home life. In connexion with this he enlarges on the interest of Holbein's portraits of the More family circle, and of their friends and contemporaries—a 'unique historic gallery of vivid and true portraits which make the men and women of the reign of Henry VIII to live again before our eyes'. Among these men and women of the period there are three—Anne Boleyn, Cromwell, and Cranmer—who get very short shrift from Sir John.

He also has an article, *Saint Thomas More as Citizen*, in *The Dublin Review* (July–Sept.). In the same number Egerton Beck writes on *Saint Thomas More and the Law*.

⁵ *Saint Thomas More*, by Sir John R. O'Connell. Duckworth. pp. 208. 6s.

G. G. Coulton in *The Faith of Sir Thomas More* (*Quarterly Rev.*, Oct.) approaches More somewhat differently from the above biographers. While recognizing that Chambers has written 'a great book', he criticizes some of his conclusions on points less directly connected with More's character than with his environment. Coulton's arguments are mainly concerned with political and theological issues. But attention may be drawn here to one or two points relating to *Utopia*. He is of one mind with Chambers in not discounting *Utopia* as a mere *jeu d'esprit* and in recognizing its earnestness and far-reaching effect. But he maintains that 'great innovators are to be judged not so much by the hundred ways in which they ran with the multitude as by the two or three . . . which they discovered for themselves'. Hence to Coulton the cardinal features of *Utopia* are community of property and private judgement in religion.

In an article on *Contemporary Models of Sir Thomas More* (*T.L.S.*, Nov. 2), H. Stanley Jevons claims that the picture of the Utopian commonwealth was largely influenced by reports that reached More during his residence in Flanders in 1515 of the Socialist Inca empire of Peru. Jevons mentions three special features common to *Utopia* and the empire—'the regimenting of families under officials, the system of colonization, and the featherwork of ceremonial vestments'. He also enumerates seven other points of similarity. The weak point of an interesting theory is that there is no proof that any European had visited Peru before 1515.

Editions of Robinson's English version of *Utopia*⁶ and of More's *The Four Last Things*⁷ have appeared. W. A. G. Doyle-Davidson writes on *The Earlier English Works of Sir Thomas More* in *English Studies*, xvii. 49–70, and Mary B. Whiting on *Sir Thomas More* (*Contemporary Review*, July).

In addition to publications relating primarily to More, mention is to be made of Richard L. Smith's dual biography, *John*

⁶ *Utopia. Written in Latin by Sir Thomas More and done into English by Ralph Robynson*, with an introduction by H. G. Wells. New York: Limited Editions Club. pp. 168.

⁷ *The Four Last Things*, by Sir Thomas More, ed. by D. O'Connor. Burns, Oates. pp. 84. 2s. 6d.

*Fisher and Thomas More: Two English Saints.*⁸ This book, which has a foreword by the Archbishop of Westminster, was written at the Venerable English College in Rome. It is the English original of the Italian *Lives* of Fisher and More which, according to custom, were presented to the Pope and other ecclesiastical dignitaries after the canonization of the two Saints in St. Peter's on 19 May 1935. It is therefore, as the preface states, a 'study primarily of their sanctity, of their characters as supernaturalized by grace, and of their martyrdom'. Thus the main features of the book are outside the scope of this survey, but, from its own point of view, it is written with scholarship and literary skill.

Of similar tendency, though addressed on more popular lines to the 'dear reader', is Vincent McNabb's *Saint John Fisher*.⁹ It gives a vigorous sketch of the career of the sturdy Yorkshireman from his birth at Beverley to his execution on Tower Hill, the first Cardinal Martyr. It includes an appreciative account of Fisher's educational activities at Cambridge and his zeal in collecting his library.

A leading article on *John Fisher and Thomas More* (*T.L.S.*, May 30), prompted by the appearance of Chambers's work and other cognate publications, contains much that is of interest. But attention may here be directed to its appreciative recognition of much of Fisher's writing as 'an abiding ornament to English prose. Here, at any rate, is a man intensely English. He goes naturally to the things of common and especially of outdoor life'—of which a number of illustrations are given. It is also pointed out that Fisher did his best to enrich his native tongue out of his own learning. Yet perhaps it was due to this that 'for all its vigour and its bold strong rhythm Fisher's prose . . . seems finite and dead beside More's'.

The year 1535 was memorable not only for the execution of Fisher and More but for the first appearance in print of the

⁸ *John Fisher and Thomas More: Two English Saints*, by Richard Lawrence Smith. Sheed and Ward. pp. xi+308. 6s.

⁹ *Saint John Fisher*, by Vincent McNabb. Sheed and Ward. pp. 126. 2s. 6d.

whole Bible in the English tongue. The 400th anniversary of this event is commemorated by Henry Guppy in *Miles Coverdale and the English Bible: 1488–1568*.¹⁰ Guppy traces Coverdale's career till the publication of his translation, finished on 4 October 1535, and discusses the bibliographical difficulties connected with the title-pages and the printer. Coverdale makes it clear that he translated not from Hebrew and Greek but from Latin and 'Douche' versions. These included the Vulgate and Luther's German version, but he closely followed Tindale's text in the New Testament and in part of the Old. But for three-fourths of the latter Coverdale's was the first printed English version. The Psalter in the 'Book of Common Prayer' is 'in essence the Psalter of the Coverdale Bible of 1535'.

In 1537 the 'Thomas Matthew' Bible appeared, based on Tindale and Coverdale. But Cromwell wished for another translation, and Coverdale set to work upon the 'Great Bible', probably, as Guppy suggests, annotating a copy of the 'Matthew' Bible. The printing of the Great Bible began in Paris, but owing to the interference of the Inquisition it had to be completed in London in April 1539. A second edition of it in April 1540 contained Cranmer's preface. Guppy calls attention to the interest of the title-page of the Great Bible, reproduced in facsimile. It is said to have been designed by Holbein and includes portraits of Henry, Cranmer, and Cromwell. Every parish church was to exhibit a copy of this Bible, and the first edition consisted of 2,500 copies. The pamphlet sketches Coverdale's later life, including his periods of residence abroad, his appointment to the Bishopric of Exeter, and his celebrity as a preacher.

An article on the *Quartercentenary of the Coverdale Bible* (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 10) deals with some of the bibliographical points discussed by Guppy, and also calls attention to the Catalogue, with a long explanatory introduction, of the John Rylands library exhibition, illustrating the history of the transmission of the Bible. J. A. Sheppard (*ibid.*, Oct. 17) gave arguments

¹⁰ *Miles Coverdale and the English Bible: 1488–1568*, by Henry Guppy. Manchester Univ. Press and John Rylands Library. pp. 30 + five facsimiles. 1s. 6d.

in favour of J. Soter and E. Cervicornus of Cologne being the printers of the 1535 Bible, working possibly at Marburg. He sets forth these arguments more fully, with reproductions of initials used by the two printers, in *The Printers of the Coverdale Bible, 1535* (*Library*, Dec.). The same number of *The Library* contains an article on *Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, by W. W. Greg, which includes interesting references to the Geneva Bible (1560) and the Bishop's Bible (1568). Greg throws light on Parker's activities as a collector and an editor and on his relations with printers.

An illustrated article by Kenneth W. Cameron on *Coverdale's Bible of 1535 and the Theory of Translation* appears in *Living Church*, Oct. 5. Cameron discusses the characteristics of Elizabethan translation in general and in relation to the Bible in particular. He shows why Tyndale's version seemed to Sir Thomas More and others to encourage heresy, and how Coverdale, though he made use of Tyndale among 'five sundry interpreters', went far to remove the points in which his predecessor had given offence.

In *John Skelton: A Genealogical Study* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.), H. L. R. Edwards begins by dissociating the poet's origin from Norfolk, where Scheltons and Sheltons are plentiful, but not Skeltons, who are first found in the north of England, especially Cumberland and Yorkshire, and before the Tudor period had spread far and wide. Several of them served in the royal household. Among these Edwards draws attention to Edward Skelton, serjeant-at-arms successively to Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III, and pensioned by Henry VII in 1486, as 'Edward Skelton, Knight'. A relationship between this Edward and the poet, 'whether paternal or merely cognate', would account for the latter's position at the Court of Henry VI's nephew and other features of his life and writings.

In 1934 Ian A. Gordon drew attention (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 151) to a version in Egerton MS. 2642 of the poem 'Of Tyme', usually attributed to Skelton, with an additional stanza. F. M. Salter reports (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 17) that there is another copy

in the Bannatyne MS. running to eleven stanzas, in Scots spelling and dialect. As the poem is unassigned by Bannatyne, and as he includes no other by Skelton, it is possible, as Salter suggests, that it circulated in Scotland before Skelton was born. He states that F. Brie would have been additionally justified in doubting Skelton's authorship, on account of the tone and quality of the poem, had he seen the Egerton and Bannatyne versions.

Bernard M. Wagner prints *New Songs of the Reign of Henry VIII* in *M.L.N.* (Nov.). The songs come from MS. Ashmole 176 in the Bodleian. Ff. 97–101 of this MS. (which are written in a hand of the second half of the sixteenth century) contain 18 songs, some of which have been printed in various collections or periodicals. Wagner reproduces eleven of the songs, nearly all love-laments, of which only one, 'This nyghtes rest, this nyghtes rest, adewe farewell this nightes rest', has been printed before, not quite correctly. This song, of 19 lines, is the longest of those printed by Wagner. They vary in metre and rhyme-scheme, and four of them consist of only two long lines. In none of the eleven reproduced by Wagner is there internal evidence of date. But as one previously printed is by Surrey, and another by Cornish, and a third is on Princess Mary dancing with her father, Wagner is presumably justified in assigning the collection to Henry VIII's reign.

In the *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* (March) A. Koszul announces his discovery in the University of Strasburg library of a copy of Bishop Percy's uncompleted edition of *Tottel's Miscellany*. Percy had finished a reprint of the text about 1767, but intending to add a commentary, he left the copies of the work first with Tonson and then with John Nichols. A fire at his warehouse in February, 1808, destroyed nearly all the sheets, and the only copy that has hitherto been traced is in two volumes in the Grenville collection in the British Museum. It is another copy of the first of these volumes that has now been found in the Strasburg library. A note in it shows that it was 'a present from the Bishop of Dromore to J. Price', who was Bodley's librarian, 1768–1813. It afterwards

belonged to J. Mitford, was sold in 1860 after his death, and found its way to the Strasburg library in 1893.

On the relation of the rediscovered Harington manuscript at Arundel Castle to *Tottel's Miscellany*, see chapter xiv, 351.

In a bibliographical note on *A Mirror for Magistrates* (*T.L.S.*, Dec. 28) Fitzroy Pyle joins issue with Lily B. Campbell in her article on *The Suppressed Edition of A Mirror for Magistrates* (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 154-5). In opposition to W. F. Trench Miss Campbell contended that Wayland's prohibited partial edition of *A Mirror* belonged to 1555. Pyle, after an examination of her arguments, supports Trench's date of 1554.

In a leading article on *The Tudor Character* (*T.L.S.*, May 9), it is said of Sir Edmund Dyer that 'he belonged to the generation before Raleigh: this was his importance poetically, as a link between Wyatt and Surrey and the full blossoming towards the end of the reign. . . . His name was chiefly known, outside the Court circle, to poets, particularly to those of the next generation who looked up to him as a father in the art.'

These observations were suggested by the publication of Ralph M. Sargent's study of Dyer's life and verse.¹¹

The *corpus* of verse in the appendix to Sargent's volume has already been amplified, for Bernard M. Wagner prints in *R.E.S.* (Oct.) *New Poems by Sir Edward Dyer*. These three poems are included in an Elizabethan poetical miscellany, MS. Harley 7392 (article 2). The miscellany, as Wagner points out, is almost entirely in the handwriting of St. Lo Knyveton, and from the character of the hand appears to date from his early years at Gray's Inn, which he entered on 25 May 1584. The first of the three poems consists of 50 lines assigned in the MS. to 'Dy[er]'. Only two lines (9-10) have hitherto been known, used as an illustration of a figure of speech by the author of *The Arte of English Poesie*, from a poem of 'maister Diars'. The second poem has 30 lines and is assigned in the MS. to 'G.O.R.', and *The Arte of English Poesie* quotes ll. 27-8 as by

¹¹ See *The Year's Work*, xv. 209-10.

'Maister Gorge', apparently Sir Arthur Gorges. Lines 29–30 are quoted without any author being named, but ll. 5–6 and 19–20 are attributed to Dyer. His authorship is therefore doubtful. The third poem, a lyric of 18 lines, is assigned in the MS. to 'Dyer', and has hitherto been unknown. MS. Harley 7392 also attributes to Dyer the poem, 'ffayne would I but I dare not', which in another MS. is ascribed to Sir W. Raleigh.

Claude E. Jones contributes *Notes on 'Fulgens and Lucres'* to *M.L.N.* (Dec.). There are some comments on the relation of the edition of Medwall's play by the present writer and A. W. Reed to the Quarto in the Huntington library. Jones adds some stage-directions and queries whether A and B are boys.

Samuel A. Tannenbaum has a long series of *Editorial Notes on 'Wit and Science'* in *P.Q.* (Oct.). He gives an account of the MS. of the play, though this seems to be based on Farmer's *facsimile*, as at the end of the article he notes that since it was written, W. B. Kempling has examined the MS. and reported to him. Tannenbaum is of opinion that, with a few slight exceptions, the transcript of the play was written by one person, even though not at one sitting, and that therefore the corrections and alterations cannot be attributed to the author. The notes deal with a number of peculiarities in the script and are intended to correct some of the errors in modern editions of *Wit and Science*.

Morris P. Tilley's *Notes on 'The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom'* (*S.A.B.*, Jan. and April) have not been available for further notice.

Harold Zühlsdorff's doctoral dissertation on the technique of the early Tudor interlude¹² is mainly concerned with the position of John Heywood in the development of English comedy, and the related wider question of the transition from medieval to modern drama. Zühlsdorff discusses first the three 'Débats' (*Love, Weather, Witty and Witless*), and afterwards what, for reasons given, he calls the 'Low-Comedy-Trilogie' (*Pardoner and Frere, The 4 P.P., Johan Johan*). He finds in the

¹² *Die Technik des komischen Zwischenspiels der frühen Tudorzeit*, von Harold Zühlsdorff. Berlin: Trilisch und Huther. pp. 77.

'Débats ganz ähnliche Spuren einer dramatischen Handlungsgestaltung . . . wie in den Low-Comedy-Interludes', and considers that this supports Heywood's authorship of both groups. In his attempted dating, however, it is surprising to find *Witty and Witless* placed almost last of the six plays.

Zülhsdorff discusses in detail the influence of French sources on Heywood. In addition to those that have been indicated by Karl Young, he points out resemblances between *Love* and the 'farce moralisée' of *Deux Hommes et leurs deux Femmes*. But, except in *Witty and Witless* and *Johan Johan*, he finds few traces of French influence on the technique, as apart from the content, of the interludes. 'Alles in allem, die formale Abhängigkeit Heywoods von den französischen Débats ist gering . . . der Abstand ist der eines anspruchslosen Unterhaltungsspiels von einem immerhin formal durchgearbeiteten Kunstwerk.'

Zülhsdorff then turns to *Fulgens and Lucres*, and while noting the debt of Heywood to Medwall, seeks to show that the earlier dramatist kept the elements of débat and low comedy apart while his successor combined them. Finally, he considers the relation of Heywood's interludes to the Moralities, and comes to the conclusion that there was an English tradition of dramatic technique 'die im geistlichen Drama entsteht, vom weltlichen Zwischenspiel aufgenommen und dann an die regelrechte Komödie, weitergegeben wird'. This dissertation contains disputable views, but it is thoughtful and scholarly.

In connexion with the question of French influence on Heywood, Sidney Thomas in *Wolsey and French Farces* (T.L.S., Dec. 7) draws attention to a remarkable statement in a letter, dated 1 Jan. 1529, from the French ambassador in London to Montmorency: 'I think Wolsey would not be well pleased if I did not tell you of his causing farces to be played in French, with great display.'

A reprint of *Roister Doister* from the unique copy in the library of Eton College has been issued by the Malone Society.¹³

¹³ *Roister Doister*: reprint under the direction of W. W. Greg. Malone Society Reprints. pp. xiv+A²-I¹.

It contains a short introduction which quotes in full the passage from Thomas Wilson's *Rule of Reason*, which establishes Udall's authorship. There is the customary list of irregular and doubtful readings, including explanations of a few unusual words. There are four collotype reproductions from pages of the original.

In *R.E.S.* (Oct.) H. J. Byrom gives particulars of *Some Law-suits of Nicholas Udall*. Four of the five suits relate to debts contracted by Udall between 1536 and 1546—'that is, while he was headmaster of Eton and in the period that intervened between his dismissal from that post and his rise to prosperity under Edward VI and Mary'. From one of these cases it appears that owing to his failure to pay £20 on bond, Udall was outlawed in the City of London from 25 November 1538 to late in 1544. Two other cases in which he was not a principal, about 1547, show that he was then living in the parish of Christ Church within Newgate, in the precincts of the lately dissolved Grey Friars.

In connexion with the school play mention may be made of a series of articles in *N. & Q.* on *Terentius Christianus*, though the published work falls outside the chronological limits of this chapter. In *N. & Q.* (Oct. 19) R. B. Hepple gave some account of the Latin plays on Biblical themes by Cornelius Schonaeus, a schoolmaster at Harlem, which were intended to combine Terentian purity of style with equal moral purity. In an article (Nov. 2) Edward Bensly gave details of the career of Schonaeus and drew attention to a statement that the title, *Terentius Christianus*, was first given to the collection of six of his plays published in Antwerp in 1598. The subject is discussed further by Bensly (Nov. 16), Hepple (Dec. 14), and R. S. Forsythe (Dec. 21).

Celesta Wine discusses in detail in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) *Nathaniel Wood's 'Conflict of Conscience'*, of which two issues, with important differences, appeared in 1581 (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 172-3), though the date of composition probably falls within the previous decade. This belated morality is based on

the career of Francesco Spiera, the Italian lawyer, whose apostasy from Protestantism brought him into a state of despair. Miss Wine gives an account of the records in various languages of his dreadful experiences. She shows from close verbal parallels that Wood must have used Edward Aglionby's *A notable and marvellous epistle*, a translation of an epistle describing Spiera's fate by the Italian Matteo Gribaldi. There were two editions before 1581 of Aglionby's version, in 1550 and 1570, the latter of which was probably used by Wood. But, as Miss Wine shows, he drew in addition upon the Bible, the anti-Catholic literature of the period, the *Golden Legend*, astrological writings, and proverbs. He displayed some dramatic instinct in his handling of his materials, in his development of the characters of Philologus, who represents Spiera, and in his creation of minor figures. Notable among them is Caconos, the priest who speaks in a Northern dialect, a peculiarity of which Miss Wine gives more than one possible explanation.

VII
SHAKESPEARE
By ALLARDYCE NICOLL

AMONG the various and varied contributions to the study of Shakespeare published during the year 1935 perhaps the most important and significant is Caroline Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery*¹—significant because it indicates one of the ways in which modern scholarship is adding to our knowledge of the dramatist, and important because this volume, awaited now for some considerable time, represents the reasoned conclusions of many years' detailed investigation. Already, of course, the subject of Shakespearian imagery has received attention, Wilson Knight in particular having sought thereby to elucidate the meaning of the tragedies; but this book of Miss Spurgeon's is the first fully to explore the entire field and to seek, by means of the evidence obtained, a co-ordinated picture of the author from whose mind these similes and metaphors flowed in such profusion. Miss Spurgeon's picture is of a man keenly sensitive to all sights and sounds, quietly observant of the thronging crowds around him, deeply imbued with a love of nature and, above all, intensely conscious of everything in life which possessed movement. In her book we find many things—a contrast between Shakespeare's imaginative power and that of his contemporaries, a discussion of the diverse kinds of images in his work as a whole, and a further discussion of that iterative imagery which colours individual tragedies and comedies. Whosoever desires to have these things in tabular form will find them provided in seven charts, dull squared sheets, no doubt, when contrasted with the material they record, yet invaluable guides to an understanding of the arguments presented in the text. More still does Miss Spurgeon give us. Thus in her appendix 'Note on the "martlet" image', where she suggests that Shakespeare knew and maybe for a time was resident at Berkeley Castle in

¹ *Shakespeare's Imagery and what it tells us*, by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon. C.U.P. 25s. net. pp. xvi + 408; 7 charts.

Gloucestershire, she throws out arresting hints to future biographers of the poet-dramatist.

That this volume cannot be regarded as final and conclusive Miss Spurgeon herself notes. 'It must be remembered', she says, 'that any count of this kind, however carefully done, must to some extent be an approximate one, dependent on the literary judgment and methods of the person who has compiled it.' How true such a statement is and how guarded we must be in basing opinions on 'images' of the type selected in this work is shown by reference to two other recently published books, Richmond Noble's analysis of *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge*,² and J. H. E. Brock's study of *Hamlet*.³ In contrasting Shakespeare and Bacon, Miss Spurgeon declares that where the latter 'noticeably differs' from the former

'is in the quantity and range of his Biblical images, which are very numerous, and come next in this respect to those of light and the body. Bacon's mind is steeped in Biblical story and phrase in a way of which there is no evidence in Shakespeare.... Shakespeare's Biblical comparisons and references—which are few—are practically all to well-known characters and incidents, familiar to any grammar-school boy.'

The interest of this judgement lies in the fact that Noble, whose excellently documented study testifies to the carefulness of his examination, comes to precisely the opposite conclusions. First, he shows that there is no likelihood that Shakespeare was taught the Bible at school. Secondly, he believes that the dramatist's allusions may 'be regarded as inconsistent with a mind impregnated in youth with Scriptural teaching'; he thinks 'it would be reasonable . . . to doubt that Shakespeare was grounded in the Bible in his home'. Thirdly, he declares that in his 'interpretation and application of Scripture, . . . Shakespeare was exceptional in his age' and in so far he contrasts him with Bacon who frequently misinterpreted and misapplied it. Fourthly, one hundred and fifty pages of his book are devoted merely to listing the unquestioned references to the Bible contained in the

² *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer as exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio*, by Richmond Noble. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d. pp. xii + 303.

³ *The Dramatic Purpose of 'Hamlet'*, by J. H. E. Brock. Cambridge: Heffer. 2s. 6d. pp. 48.

plays, with the almost total omission of 'allusions to the Fall of Man, the Cursing of the Earth, the Tenth Commandment, the Redemption of Man and the Lord's Prayer'—precisely the common themes which Miss Spurgeon believes make up the sum of Shakespeare's Biblical references. The meticulousness with which Noble's volume has been prepared is demonstrated by the fact that he has been at pains to determine both the versions which Shakespeare must have used and the ways in which he is likely to have acquired his knowledge of the Bible, and his arguments (such as those on 'the base Iudean') serve to convince us that indeed his mind was steeped, and steeped deeply, in Scriptural story. Clearly, if we are to use imagery to paint a portrait of Shakespeare's mind and nature, such a study as Noble's must be taken to augment or correct Miss Spurgeon's general survey.

Brock's essay on *Hamlet* strives to emphasize the exactitude of Shakespeare's insight into human thought and emotion. Hamlet he finds a 'maniac depressive' type which has been delineated in an 'exhaustive and masterly' manner. He treats the Ghost as an evil force, wholly egocentric, striving to play on the one flaw in Hamlet's nature—his tendency to permit passion to break down the pales and forts of reason. For our immediate purposes especially important is Brock's emphasis on one aspect of the hero's personality. That Hamlet was not interested in politics or military questions he demonstrates: 'There was, however, one subject which at any time could be relied on to draw Hamlet out of his reserve, and that was drama and the stage.' This judgement Brock proceeds to substantiate by reference to eleven important passages in the play. Now, in Miss Spurgeon's tabulation of the 279 images in *Hamlet* the theatre is credited with four contributions, while she draws attention to the total 'small number from the theatre' in the range of his dramatic writing. Brock's examples, of course, are not all 'images' in her sense and no question need arise of omission from her account; but again we recognize the need of counter-balancing and augmenting considerations when we depart from recording and tabulating to the building-up of conclusions based on such evidence. Miss Spurgeon's work is masterly; it has contributed much to our knowledge of Shakespeare; and probably

it will contribute much more when sufficient time has passed for its assimilation with the results of other modern investigations.

The discrepancy between her and Noble's statements regarding Shakespeare's Biblical knowledge was noted by Kenneth Muir in a note on *Shakespeare's Imagery* (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 17); in her reply Miss Spurgeon observed that the results were bound to differ in that, while others based their remarks on references, she based hers on imagery alone. Such a reply emphasizes the distinctive nature of her work, but it does not explain the discrepancy itself nor does it obviate the difficulty of founding general 'character' judgements on what is admittedly but part of Shakespeare's poetic contribution.

Among books essaying to present pictures of the 'essential Shakespeare', John Middleton Murry's is likely to take a high place.⁴ Starting with some brilliantly written pages expressive of the wonder of the Folio and of the peculiarities of the creative imagination, Murry endeavours, without departing from known fact or reasonable conjecture, to set forth his hero's spiritual history. Cleverly he combines the fragmentary evidence at our disposal with skilful use of imagery and with impartial analysis of the plays. This book is one of true criticism: it shows an alert and interesting mind in contact with master-pieces. The sonnet-story is capably handled and there are sections, such as those on *King John* and *The Merchant of Venice*, of particular excellence. Especially noteworthy is Murry's treatment of what he calls 'the Shakespeare man' who, taking shape as the Bastard Falconbridge and Mercutio, developed into Henry V and Hamlet, even at the same time as he split his personality and became at once Hotspur and Falstaff. As an interpretation of Shakespeare's entire life-work no less than as a series of essays devoted to separate plays, Murry's *Shakespeare* must be welcomed.

A lengthy study of Shakespeare and his times has come from the pen of Joseph Gregor.⁵ As may be expected, this book con-

⁴ *Shakespeare*, by John Middleton Murry. Jonathan Cape. pp. 448. 12s. 6d.

⁵ *Shakespeare: Der Aufbau eines Zeitalters*, by Joseph Gregor. Vienna, Phaidon-Verlag. pp. 680. RM. 3.75.

siders Shakespeare fundamentally as a dramatist and has much to say concerning the theatre both of Elizabethan and later times. The first chapter sketches out the social and artistic principles operative in the sixteenth century. From that the author proceeds to an account of the poetic theatre which was being established in the days when Shakespeare was but a youth and of the physical stage built up by the actors. The plays, from *Titus Andronicus* to *Henry VIII*, are then set in the frame thus provided for them and their stage history is surveyed. Gregor's wide knowledge of the Renaissance theatre and his sense of dramatic values makes this a valuable volume.

Another general book on Shakespeare is M. R. Ridley's 'commentary' issued to accompany the 'New Temple' edition.⁶ The contents give a sketch of the life, brief notes on the plays, an account of the Elizabethan theatre, a survey of modern textual method, together with an essay on the language of the plays (the last contributed by J. N. Bryson). The section which calls for special attention is that on 'the determination of the text', since this discusses a subject to which has been devoted much effort in recent years. Ridley sets forth here the principles which have guided him in the preparation of his edition and not unamusingly gives a number of modern instances to establish his arguments. From these instances he comes to the conclusion that many 'bibliographical' dogmas are untenable or, at best, may be applied only with reservations. He declares, for example, that 'the statement, "this emendation cannot be accepted, because it is graphically impossible," is not worth the paper it is written on'. Already this chapter has met with considerable comment and discussion.

To the qualities of Shakespeare's verse Richard David confines himself in *The Janus of Poets*.⁷ This is a suggestive essay aiming 'to discover exactly what Shakspere, as a *dramatic poet*, was doing, and how he came to do it'. Not least interesting

⁶ *William Shakespeare: A Commentary*, by M. R. Ridley. Dent. pp. viii+195. 2s.

⁷ *The Janus of Poets: Being an Essay on the Dramatic Value of Shakspere's Poetry both good and bad*, by Richard David. C.U.P. pp. xii+164. 5s.

are David's views concerning certain passages of 'lofty' verse, which he sees as deliberate burlesque on an artificial style, intended to reveal hypocrisy or self-delusion in the characters from whose mouths they proceed.

F. Knorr's *William Shakespeare* (*Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendlbildung*, 1935, Heft 4) may be mentioned here as an effort to reach the inner philosophy of the plays—a theme concerning which we may argue with no end. *Shakespeare and the Ordinary Man* (*Dalhousie Review*, July) is discussed by G. H. Murphy. There is little of value in the section devoted to the dramatist in A. J. Russell's *Their Religion*.⁸

No fresh documentary material bearing on Shakespeare's life has been unearthed recently. In *The Name Shakespeare at Bishop's Tachbrooke* (*N. and Q.*, May 18) E. Vine Hall gives examples from 1557 to the eighteenth century; M. Dormer Harris has another note in *N. and Q.* (June 1) on *Shakespeare and the Trusses of Billesley*. *The Arlaud-Duchange Portrait of Shakespeare* is discussed by Giles E. Dawson (*Library*, Dec.). This portrait, which appeared in Theobald's edition of 1733 and in some copies of Rowe's 1709 edition, has been proved to belong to 1709, with retouchings later. Frederick C. Wellstood contributes comments on some new documents acquired by the Birthplace (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Feb.).

Various studies have been published during the year on Shakespeare's artistry. Sir John Squire writes a general book on *Shakespeare as a Dramatist*.⁹ This work carries us over familiar ground with infectious spirit and enthusiasm. Squire prefaches his remarks with an introduction in which he contrasts Shakespeare's outlook with the outlook of modern playwrights; much of this has value, but it may be questioned whether any good can come of imagining Shaw in 1600 or Shakespeare in 1935. There is a certain fun to be derived from such conjectures, yet we must decide that, for critical purposes, they are useless.

⁸ *Their Religion*, by A. J. Russell. Hodder and Stoughton, 1934. pp. 352. 5s.

⁹ *Shakespeare as a Dramatist*, by Sir John Squire. Cassell. pp. xi+233. 8s. 6d.

'Mr. Shaw as an Elizabethan dramatist is inconceivable: imagine him at the Mermaid calling for water and the whites of poached eggs. . . . Imagine him trying to persuade Burbage to produce, or the audience to listen to, a play aimed at improving the sanitation of London'—

to such imaginings the only answer is that it were fruitless to postulate a Shavian intelligence, nurtured by modern ideas, in a past epoch. That 'Shakespeare suited his age' and that 'Mr. Shaw suits his', result from the training and experience of each, and to divorce training and experience from the man or from the age in which he lives is misleading. Squire's later remarks on Plot, Construction, and Dialogue contain much of sterling value and are inspired by acute observation and innate sense of appreciation.

A somewhat similar, but considerably more detailed study is that which Arthur Colby Sprague devotes to *Shakespeare and the Audience*.¹⁰ 'The fundamental purposes and methods of the dramatist as illustrated by Shakespeare's practice' might have been the title of Sprague's book, which, both because of its scholarship and of its understanding approach, merits attention. Starting from fundamental considerations relating to the arts of drama and novel (with their emphatic truth—"The novel needs all the form it can get") and proceeding through the discussion of theatrical conventions, exposition, and conclusions, surprise, testimony, the chorus, heroes, and villains, Sprague carries us onward with lively interest. His book is one that should have value not only for students of Elizabethan literature but for those whose efforts are directed towards the practical stage of our time; from his analysis both might learn much. With Sprague's elaborate survey may be mentioned shorter essays by Max I. Wolff, *Shakespeare und sein Publikum* (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*), and Robert Withington, *The Continuity of Dramatic Development* (*S.A.B.*, April); the latter emphasizes the importance of the public for the theatre, and traces various dramatic styles dependent upon altering tastes.

¹⁰ *Shakespeare and the Audience: A Study in the Technique of Exposition*, by Arthur Colby Sprague. Harvard and O.U. Presses. pp. xi + 327. 10s. 6d.

A 'moderate' view concerning the judgements of E. E. Stoll's *Art and Artifice in Shakespeare* is expressed by Floris Delattre in '*L'Illusion émotionnelle*' dans *Shakespeare* (*Rev. Ang.-Amér.*, June). Thomas M. Raysor writes on *The Ästhetic Significance of Shakespeare's Handling of Time* (*S. in Ph.*, April)—an important article in which arguments are presented for the continuous performance of the plays. Raysor notes that scenes of 'padding' are invariably introduced to mark the passage of time and regards this as a cardinal element in Shakespearian dramaturgy. Self-mockery is detected by P. V. Kreider in his article on *Genial Literary Satire in the Forest of Arden* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.); he believes that Shakespeare is able, without damaging the spirit of his comedy, to cast ridicule on the falsity of the conventional material he is using. *Flyting in Shakespeare's Comedies* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.) is analysed by Margaret Galway. She discovers thirteen comic 'flytings' of a major sort and many other disguised examples; the device, she thinks, was currently accepted by the audience as an element in contemporary drama. Elmer Edgar Stoll, in *The Dramatic Texture of Shakespeare* (*Criterion*, July), contrasts Shakespeare's methods with those of Ibsen and of Sophocles. A kindred study by the same author is *OEdipus and Othello: Corneille, Rymer and Voltaire* (*Rev. Ang.-Amér.*, June). Reviewing the misconceptions of earlier critics, Stoll decides that 'the greatest, most fruitful situations, which embrace more than experience, are necessarily improbable, and the dramatist's art lies in fully profiting by the liberty thus attained and also subduing or obscuring the attendant inconvenience'. Shakespeare is distinguished from other dramatists by his skill in giving us 'the impression of things coming to us by brilliant flashes of intuition'. *Shakespeare und die Rhetorik* (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*) forms the subject of an essay by Walter F. Schirmer.

Shakespeare's wild flowers and other country matters are surveyed by Eleanour Rohde¹¹ in a book which should interest garden-lovers no less than students of Shakespeare. Though

¹¹ *Shakespeare's Wild Flowers: Fairy Lore, Gardens, Herbs, Gatherers of Simples and Bee Lore*, by Eleanour Sinclair Rohde. Medici Society. pp. 236. 8s. 6d.

without deep scholarship Miss Rohde succeeds in presenting her facts in an interesting way and in holding our attention while she speculates on such topics as the gardens that Shakespeare knew. The coloured illustrations from Jacques le Moigne de Morgues add to the attractiveness of the book. On home-life in Shakespeare Cumberland Clark has written in the manner in which he dealt with science and the supernatural.¹² He here covers all topics from Elizabethan houses, their furniture, gardens, servants, meal-times, and entertainments, to the costume of their inhabitants. From a variety of diverse sources of information the author brings clearly before us the domestic life of Elizabethan England and gathers conveniently together Shakespeare's references to things of the home.

Shakespeare und die Psychiatrie forms a chapter in Alfred E. Hoche's *Aus der Werkstatt*.¹³ An essay on *Shakespeare's Psychopathical Knowledge: A Study in Criticism and Interpretation* is contributed by Irving I. Edgar to *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (April-June). Edgar notes the high esteem in which the dramatist has been held by medical men for his acuteness of observation and the psychological interpretation of his characters. Edgar contributes another article, *Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge: A Study in Criticism*, to *Annals of Medical History*. In this he relates the dramatist's learning in medical science to the opinions and theories of his contemporaries. André Adriès has an interesting study of contemporary medical knowledge and of Shakespeare's treatment of various abnormalities.¹⁴

Many studies of Shakespearian characters have appeared during the year. John W. Draper continues his well-known series of essays with *Ophelia and Laertes* (*P.Q.*, Jan.), *Lord Chamberlain Polonius* (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*), *Hamlet's School-fellows* (*Eng. Stud.*, lix, Heft 3), *Shakespeare's Italianate Courtier*, *Osric* (*Rev. de Litt. Comp.*, April-June), and *Usury in 'The Merchant of Venice'* (*Mod. Phil.*, Aug.). The Polonius:

¹² *Shakespeare and Home Life*, by Cumberland Clark. Williams and Norgate. pp. 256. 10s. 6d.

¹³ *Aus der Werkstatt*, von Alfred E. Hoche. Munich, J. E. Lehmann's Verlag. pp. vi + 259. RM. 6.

¹⁴ *Shakespeare et la folie: étude médico-psychologique*, by André Adriès. Paris, Librairie Maloine. pp. 315.

family, he notes, runs 'true to Elizabethan type'. Its solidarity is characteristic. 'Not heredity', Draper avers, 'but environment in the form of social status, dominates the plot of *Hamlet*.' What may be styled the 'Draper' method is pursued by Nadine Page in *Beatrice: 'My Lady Disdain'* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) and in *The Public Repudiation of Hero* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.). Beatrice is viewed as 'a character well developed according to Renaissance ideals of the "free" woman', while Hero's unfortunate lot is interpreted according to the prevailing standards of the time. Akin to these articles is Z. S. Fink's *Jaques and the Malcontent Traveller* (*P.Q.*, July), in which an attempt is made to demonstrate that, in spite of the discrepancy of opinion concerning him, Jaques is a true picture of the contemporary traveller viewed as a 'malcontent' or melancholic type. With Fink's article may be associated a carefully wrought essay on *Jaques* by Oscar James Campbell (*Huntington Library Bulletin*, Oct.). Campbell believes that the use of the term 'malcontent' in the sixteenth century was so inexact that the public could not have visualized from the word 'any clearly defined type of eccentric'. Jaques, he thinks, 'was presented at first in a way which would inevitably suggest to an Elizabethan audience a man of natural phlegmatic temperament'; on this general judgement Campbell gives many interesting comments, particularly on the neglected 'adustion' or burning of the humours. In thus presenting Jaques Shakespeare seemingly had a satiric purpose and in so far the dramatist draws near to the aims of the band of satirists who stirred London about the year 1600. 'The appearance of Jaques, then, signalizes Shakespeare's first participation in the satiric movement, which after 1599 began to capture English comedy.' Both Fink's article and that of Campbell should be compared with Kreider's notes on literary satire, cited above.

On *Shakespeare's Miranda* Marie H. Sturgiss writes in *S.A.B.* (Jan.). This heroine, a combination of the ideal and the actual, she sees as based mainly on contemporary conceptions of womanly grace and virtue. Harold R. Walley discusses *Shakespeare's Portrayal of Shylock* in *The Parrott Presentation Volume* (pp. 213-42).¹⁵ In this Walley treats Shylock as a consistently

¹⁵ *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume*,

presented villain, and refuses to admit that there is any possibility of viewing him sympathetically. Particularly on the theory 'that Shakespeare's character simply got out of hand and proceeded to play tricks upon his creator' does he pour his ridicule. Comments of this kind by Quiller-Couch he dismisses as 'mere whistling in the dark. However the leisure of prose narrative may allow unpremeditated philanderings, the economy of the stage is otherwise. Drama is a strict art, and has no place for pointless digressions.' This may be true, yet digressions, pointless and otherwise, do creep into individual plays, and more than one modern playwright has left record of the way in which his characters have so gripped the imagination that the creative artist lay helpless in their power. On Shakespeare's acute observation of the Jewish attitude there is a note in *Shakespeare's Jew* (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Jan.). The same journal presents H. B. Charlton's racy and penetrating essay on *Falstaff*. The possibility that Walley denies is here admitted: 'In the sheer abandon of [Shakespeare's] imaginative fervour, Falstaff and the circumstances he overcomes are projected by the unthinking zest of the author's imaginative apprehension, and shape themselves into a coherent universe which the play makes for itself.' The conflict between this universe and the universe without causes, in Charlton's view, Shakespeare's 'bitter disillusionment and his willingness to call the contemptible caricature of *The Merry Wives* by the name of Sir John Falstaff'. 'Falstaff and his friends' are examined also by Cumberland Clark.¹⁶ Hubertis Cummings in *For Shakespeare's Hamlet* (*The Parrott Presentation Volume*, pp. 87–102) attempts to escape from modern critical theories and to present the wholeness of conception in Shakespeare's hero. J. E. Baker's *The Philosophy of Hamlet* (*ibid.*, pp. 455–70) discusses the dramatic philosophy of the prince and shows its connexions with Platonic idealism. In *Hamlet the Man*¹⁷ E. E. Stoll inquires how the

by pupils of Professor Thomas Marc Parrott, ed. by Hardin Craig. Princeton and O.U. Presses. pp. viii + 470. 21s.

¹⁶ *Falstaff and his Friends*, by Cumberland Clark. Shrewsbury: Wilding. pp. 135. 5s.

¹⁷ *Hamlet the Man*, by Elmer Edgar Stoll. (English Association Pamphlet 91.) pp. 29. 2s. 6d.

dramatist, having 'dispensed with a psychology', succeeds in making a living character 'out of all this highly coloured abundance, or indeed in spite of it'. W. J. Lawrence in '*To Be or Not to Be*: A Revelation (*Life and Letters*, Dec. 1934) argues that originally Hamlet's soliloquy stood earlier in the play, that it contains autobiographical material, and that Hamlet's uncertainty concerning the ghost is the motive force in the tragedy. Hamlet's sanity is asserted by Fayette C. Ewing.¹⁸ Lorenz Morsbach devotes a pamphlet to surveying Shakespeare's treatment of Julius Caesar.¹⁹

The question of 'The Genuine Text' has occupied considerable attention lately. C. S. Lewis (*T.L.S.*, May 2) believes we must take the prompt-text as our basis, accepting anything which Shakespeare did not specifically disclaim. Certain duties, he observes, were delegated to the prompter and accordingly, since we are considering plays and not poems, the latter's contributions must be incorporated in our final count. The same subject is dealt with by J. D. Wilson (*ibid.*, May 16) who refers to the 'complete' *Hamlet*, which he decides is an incomparable acting drama and represents Shakespeare's full intention. To this view C. S. Lewis (*ibid.*, May 23) demurs, while W. J. Lawrence (*ibid.*, May 23) draws attention to the fact that the 'complete' text of *Hamlet* is confused and, in any case, is the work of latter-day editors. This theme is discussed further by J. D. Wilson (*ibid.*, May 30 and June 13), M. R. Ridley (*ibid.*, May 30), W. W. Greg (*ibid.*, June 6), and W. J. Lawrence (*ibid.*, June 6).

The discussion concerning a 'Pocket Shakespeare' also continues.²⁰ Mrs. O. W. Campbell started this ball once more a rolling by criticizing some readings in the 'New Temple' *Hamlet* (*T.L.S.*, June 20): to this M. R. Ridley replied (June 27). In succeeding issues of the same journal (July 4, July 18, and August 8) Peter Alexander, Mrs. Campbell, and Ridley pursued the question further.

¹⁸ *Hamlet. An Analytic and Psychologic Study*, by Fayette C. Ewing. Boston, Stratford Co. pp. 32. 50 cents.

¹⁹ *Shakespeares Cäsarbild*, von Lorenz Morsbach. Halle, Max Niemeyer. pp. 32. RM. 1.80.

²⁰ See *The Year's Work*, xv. 162.

R. B. McKerrow provides *A Suggestion regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.). The suggestion is that irregularity in character names indicates that the text is derived from the author's manuscript. McKerrow conjectures that the author has here varied his designation in accordance with his shifting attitude towards the creatures of his imagination.

The controversy concerning the use of shorthand continues. W. Matthews, writing on *Shakespeare and the Reporters* (*Library*, March), emphasizes once more the fact that the Bales and Bright systems must be taken together and declares that the use of these would have been wholly unsuitable for the reporting of plays. Even sermons, he notes, could not thus be taken down *verbatim*. The same author, in *Peter Bales, Timothy Bright and William Shakespeare* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.), discusses in full the principles of Bales's *Brachygraphy* and usefully reprints the tables in that book. *The Quarto of 'King Lear' and Bright's Shorthand* (*Mod. Phil.*, Nov.) is dealt with by Madeleine Doran. Referring to Quincy Adams's article of 1933,²¹ she points out that many passages have been printed correctly and believes that this would have been almost impossible by the use of Bright's system. Her examination of the text is long and detailed, an important contribution to the study of the quarto. Edward Hubler, in *The Verse Lining of the First Quarto of 'King Lear'* (*Parrott Presentation Volume*, pp. 421–41) also believes that reporting need not be the explanation of the peculiarities of this text. In his discussion he compares the quarto with that of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me*.

Robert M. Smith, writing on *An Interesting First Folio* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.), gives notes on the copy with manuscript corrections brought to light by Gabriel Wells in 1934. The more important of these corrections are here recorded. An important list of quartos at present locatable is presented by Henrietta C. Bartlett in *First Editions of Shakespeare's Quartos* (*Library*, Sept.). Brief notes on *The Folger Folios* are contributed by Robert M. Smith (*T.L.S.*, March 7). Dudley Hutcherson writes on the Virginia set of *Forged Quartos* (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 3). Sir

²¹ See *The Year's Work*, xiv. 183.

Sidney Lee had argued that these originally came to the library as separate items, but Hutcherson, using an old catalogue entry, demonstrates that they were presented in one volume before the year 1828. An interesting note on *Charles Jennens as Editor of Shakespeare* (*Library*, Sept.) is contributed by Gordon Crosse. His judgement is that Jennens, although eccentric, was considerably ahead of his time in editorial ideals. In *An Unchronicled Shakespeare Edition* (T.L.S., Nov. 2) Davidson Cook notes a hitherto unrecorded *Popular Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare* in six volumes, undated but belonging to about 1800.

Many fresh problems relating to the text spring obviously from J. Dover Wilson's recent work on *Hamlet*, to an editor the most puzzling of all plays. The year 1935 has seen the appearance of Wilson's critical essay on the drama—*What Happens in 'Hamlet'*.²² This is a book which cannot adequately be dealt with here. No subtler or more arresting interpretation of Shakespeare's masterpiece has been written and its closely-knit arguments will, it is certain, engage the attentions of many students to come. Wilson has endeavoured to hold a balance between an 'historical' and a creatively interpretative study of the play. Rightly, he emphasizes the need of understanding current Elizabethan ideas concerning the nature of ghosts, without which we must fail to appreciate the purposes of the dramatist and the original reactions of a Globe audience in 1603. By applying his knowledge of Renaissance fencing methods, too, Wilson has succeeded in throwing fresh light on the concluding scene of almost universal carnage. In these things the author is on sure ground, but, as he himself recognizes, the play of *Hamlet* is fraught with doubts and problems, so that other of his conjectures may be regarded with something of a critical suspicion. Particularly questionable is the treatment of the dumb-show scene. Why, he asks, does Claudius not recognize the parallel to his crime before ever the player-villain utters the speech which presumably Hamlet has given him to con? Wilson's solution is a clever one: Hamlet, he thinks, did not expect the dumb-show and, when he sees the players well on their way

²² *What Happens in 'Hamlet'*, by J. Dover Wilson. C.U.P. pp. viii + 334. 12s. 6d.

thus to bungle his ‘mouse-trap’, displays his annoyance and perturbation in his words to Ophelia; luckily for him, however, Claudius is so intent on watching his nephew that he misses all this preliminary ‘argument’ of the players and so comes to the spoken drama innocent of what must follow. On paper, Wilson’s defence of this interpretation is convincing; but *Hamlet* is not a mere collection of words set in lines upon paper sheets—it is a play, and as a play must be construed. So considered, it is evident that no spectator ignorant of the *Hamlet* theme could possibly follow so tortuous a dramatic procedure. That spectator has been told that the play-within-the-play is to be a test, and accordingly, when the court assembles, his attention will be fixed on this new element in the action. Even if, following Horatio, he turns his gaze on Claudius, he could not conceivably watch, first, the players’ action, secondly, the King, and thirdly, Hamlet, all at once. No self-respecting playwright would expect so much and we cannot imagine that Shakespeare, apt in these matters, would have let the scene stand so without a word of explanation. Were proof needed of the impossibility of this interpretation, the performance of the play by the Marlowe Society would provide it. There the Wilson procedure was followed, but, even to those familiar with *What Happens in ‘Hamlet’*, the points could not adequately be conveyed by actors to audience.

One may question, too, the interpretation of the ‘Fishmonger’ and ‘Nunnery’ scenes. Wilson believes that Hamlet has overheard the talk of ‘loosing’ Ophelia upon him, has interpreted that word in a gross way, and accordingly treats Ophelia as a whore and her father as a procurer. Again, the paper argument for this is convincing, but its manipulation on the stage leaves us confident that, had Shakespeare so intended it, he would have made his purposes clearer in actual words. Much may be allusive and suggestive in these plays, but rarely does Shakespeare fail to provide clues to the interpretation of such scenes as those described. Concerning a motive there may be doubt, for there we are in the midst of the mysteries of the human spirit—even concerning relationships between character and character we may be unsure—but where dramatic business is in question Shakespeare, knowing his trade and the limitations of an audience, usually is a consummate and exact practitioner.

Wilson's reconstructed history of the *Hamlet* text is challenged by E. K. Broadus in *Polonius* (*Univ. of Toronto Quarterly*, April). He decides that *Der bestrafte Brudermord* represents an early version of the play, and argues that old Corambus was later reworked into a Polonius who caricatured Burghley. *Hamlet's Verschickung nach England* (*Archiv*, clxvii. 3 and 4) is carefully examined for its dramatic purpose by E. Weigelin. Levin L. Schücking discusses *The Churchyard-scene in Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, V, i (*R.E.S.*, April), arguing that this episode was a later insertion devised, first, to provide dramatic interest for the end of the play, and, second, to throw additional emphasis on Hamlet's passion. There has been some considerable debating concerning *Hamlet's Own Lines*—the lines he gave to the players. E. H. C. Oliphant (*T.L.S.*, Aug. 29) thinks there can be no doubt but that these were the verses beginning 'Faith, I must leave thee, love'. George Sampson (*ibid.*, Sept. 5) tries to show the absurdity of treating an imaginary Hamlet as if he were a real person; Fitzroy Pyle (*ibid.*, Sept. 12) also asserts that the attempt to identify the precise lines overlooks the rules of dramatic art. In '*The Murder of Gonzago*: A Probable Source for 'Hamlet'' (*M.L.R.*, Oct.) G. Bullough draws attention to the circumstances surrounding the death of Francesco Maria I della Rovere, duke of Urbino. Poisoning was suspected and some persons accused Luigi Gonzaga, marchese di Castelgoffredo. Bullough finds the influence of these events both in the play-within-the-play and in the main text. John Purves thinks *The Dumb-Show in 'Hamlet'* (*T.L.S.*, Sept. 19) is more in the nature of an abbreviated *commedia dell'arte* show than in that of a mere 'argomento'. In *The Rugged Pyrrhus and Hamlet* (*T.L.S.*, Nov. 23) H. W. Crundell argues that the player's speech must be seriously intended and written by Shakespeare. Alfred Kelcy contributes various *Notes on 'Hamlet'* to *S.A.B.* (July). '*Too too sullied Flesh*' is further examined by J. D. Wilson, W. L. Renwick, and G. M. Young in *T.L.S.* (Jan. 3, Jan. 10, Jan. 17, and Jan. 24). H. W. Crundell also writes on the phrase in *N. and Q.* (Feb. 16), noting an apparent reminiscence in Donne which points to 'sallied' or 'solid' rather than to 'sullied'. An anonymous writer, in '*Hamlet*: A Query' (*N. and Q.*, June 15) interprets 'wild' in the phrase 'men's minds are wild'

as meaning 'bewildered'. Karl Young writes of i. ii. 186-8, in *The Interpretation of a Passage in 'Hamlet'* (*M.L.R.*, July). He argues that Horatio's lines should be punctuated to read 'I saw him—once, a' was a goodly King—'.

C. G. Beckingham, writing on '*Othello*' and '*Revenge for Honour*' (*R.E.S.*, April), notes a parallel in the latter which justifies the reading of 'Indian' in *Othello*, v. ii. 347. R. A. Law supports Tucker Brooke's interpretation of 'Almost damn'd in a fair wife' (i. i. 21) in *Univ. of Texas Studies in English* (July). *Elaboration of Setting in 'Othello' and the Emphasis of the Tragedy* is examined by Julia Grace Wales (*Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters*, xxix. 319-40). She demonstrates the rich use of local colour in this play and discusses Othello as a 'barbarian'. Andrew S. Cairncross endeavours to establish *The Date of 'Othello'* (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 24). He observes that certain passages in the bad quartos seem to be taken from earlier plays, and, finding such use of both *Othello* and *Pericles* in this way, he argues that these two dramas must have been conceived before 1602. Richmond Noble (*ibid.*, Dec. 14) deems, from the presence of a singing boy in all, that *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Othello* must all date between 1601 and 1603.

G. B. Harrison writes on *The Background to 'King Lear': A Time of Troubles and Portents* (*T.L.S.*, Dec. 28). This tragedy was acted at court on 26 December 1606, and has borrowings from Harsnett (entered in the Stationers' Register on 16 March 1603). 'The events of the months between March, 1603, and December, 1606,' declares Harrison, not quite logically, 'will therefore be the contemporary background to *King Lear*.' Deciding categorically that Raleigh was one of the 'Main and Bye' plotters (a fact not wholly established by contemporary evidence), he endeavours to show that the play is inspired by the general feeling of horror and apprehension at this time. *King Lear*, III. vi. 6-7, occupies the attention of F. E. Budd in *Shakespeare, Chaucer and Harsnett* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.). The phrase 'Nero is an Angler in the Lake of Darkness' Budd cleverly identifies by reference to his sources. He is no doubt justified in declaring that this reveals Shakespeare's mental processes—fiend, fiddler, and the lake of darkness getting telescoped in his mind. In

A Note on 'King Lear', I. iv. 364-7 (*N. and Q.*, Jan. 26), H. W. Crundell proposes 'attach'd' for the 'attask'd' of the second quarto. *Metrisch-grammatisches zu Shakespeares 'King Lear'* (*Anglia*, July) occupies the attention of Wilhelm Franz.

Walter Clyde Curry's *Macbeth's Changing Character* (*J.E.G.P.*, July) is a 'philosophical' study of the play wherein the hero is related to scholastic ideas of good and evil. The 'principles of scholastic philosophy', believes Curry, 'have exerted a formative influence upon Shakespeare's conception of Macbeth's changing character'. *Exemplum Materials underlying 'Macbeth'* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) are noted by Beatrice Daw Brown. This is an interesting essay in which an endeavour is made to show how various moralized tales have been incorporated in the drama. Certain points may be overstressed, but the main argument is good. Alois Brandl in *Zur Quelle des 'Macbeth'* (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx. 1) examines the chronicles of Hector Boethius, John Bellenden, and Holinshed. 'Sere', thinks C. T. Onions, in *Macbeth*, v. iii. 23, is to be taken as a noun meaning 'withered state' (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 24).

The Original Staging of 'Romeo and Juliet', Act III, scene V (*T.L.S.*, Sept. 19) is examined by W. J. Lawrence. He casts ridicule on those who believe there was a shifting here from upper stage to lower—a hopelessly untheatric device. George Sampson also writes on this theme (*ibid.*, Nov. 9) and remarks adversely on various modern stage-directions. A. Trampe Bödtker discusses *Arthur Brooke and his Poem* (*Eng. Stud.*, lxx. 1). In *Titus Andronicus*, II. iii. 124-6 (*T.L.S.*, Dec. 7), Walter Worrall would read 'that painted hobby', identifying this as a kind of trap to catch birds, a painted piece of wood.

Fred Sorensen writes on '*The Masque of the Muscovites*' in *Love's Labour's Lost* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.). He notes the description of a 'Russian' masking of 1510 at the court of Henry VIII, given in Hall's *Chronicles* and repeated in the Holinshed of 1587. This, rather than the Gray's Inn Revels of 1595, may have been Shakespeare's source. Burns Martin in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 24) wonders whether that play might not have been composed for the double wedding of Lady Elizabeth

and Lady Katherine Somerset to Henry Guildford and William Petre on 8 November 1596. In *Die Entstehung des Sommernachtstraums (Anglia, July)* Wolfgang Keller identifies this occasion with the marriage of Countess Mary of Southampton to Sir Thomas Heneage on 2 May 1594, incidentally demonstrating the play's connexion with Llyl's *Galathea*. Allison Gow inquires *Is Shakespeare's 'Much Ado' a Revised Earlier Play?* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.). This is a very careful and logically worked-out paper, arguing against the existence of an earlier version whether written by Shakespeare or another. Naturally his discussions are concerned mainly with the theories presented in the 'New Cambridge' edition. William T. Hastings provides several *Notes on 'All's Well that Ends Well'* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.). These concern, first, the use of two Frenchmen described as G. and E. Hastings argues that in II. i and III. i there were two brothers Dumain, and that Parolles' man may be identified as '1. Lord', 'Lord G.', and 'French G.'. The two Lords of I. ii and the two Gentlemen of III. ii were not, in his opinion, the Dumains. A second note discusses the position of the King in II. i: Hastings believes that the Folio is correct and that this character does not leave the stage. *Accounting for Irregularities in Cloten* (*S.A.B.*, April), Wendell Magee Keck believes that Robert Armin played both Cloten and the First Gaoler; it is further suggested that he may have been responsible for writing or for revising some scenes, thus creating the inconsistencies noted. The sources, problems, and stage history of *The Comedy of Errors* have been surveyed by Marianne Labinski;²³ she also provides notes for a modern production of the play. An important survey, introducing rich material on Renaissance theories concerning the supernatural, is Walter Clyde Curry's *Sacerdotal Science in Shakespeare's 'The Tempest'* (*Archiv*, Oct., Dec.). The relationship between Caliban and theories regarding the savage occupies the attention of Hans Neuhof in *Die Calibangestalt in Shakespeares 'Sturm'* (*Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, March–April).

A. L. Everett supports Peter Alexander's view in *A Note on Shakespeare's 'Henry VI'* (*S.A.B.*, April). W. W. Greg in

²³ *Shakespeares Komödie der Irrungen: Das Werk und seine Gestaltung auf der Bühne*, von Marianne Labinski. Diss., Breslau, 1934. pp. 98.

'*Henry VI*' and the Contention Plays (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) reviews an article by Greer, originally printed in 1933.²⁴ Another article of 1933,²⁵ by R. B. McKerrow, forms the basis of Lucille King's '*2 and 3 Henry VI*'—which *Holinshed?* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.). From an examination of the Folio text she decides that the edition of 1587, and not that of 1577, was used by the author. *Shakespeare's Debt to Hall and Holinshed in 'Richard III'* (*S. in Ph.*, April) is discussed by Edleen Begg. Her judgement is that Shakespeare studied both accounts with equal care and made free use of both. There is, she declares, 'no main historical source' for the play. In an interesting paper on *2 Henry IV* Marion A. Taylor essays to show *How Falstaff brought Holinshed up to date* (*S.A.B.*, July). Taylor notes the reference in the play to Sir John Colvile of the Dale. Such a person is named among others in *Holinshed*, but she believes that his singling-out here is due to the presence in London at that time of a notorious Scots traitor named John Colville. This man's adventuresome but iniquitous career she traces at length and hazards the suggestion that he was a figure well-known to Shakespeare's audiences. Hall and *Holinshed* also occupy the attention of Karl Otto Braun in a carefully executed study.²⁶ A. E. M. Kirkwood writes on *King Richard the Second*.²⁷ In this essay he examines the place of *Richard II* among the histories, its debt to *Holinshed*, and its tragic import. *The Non-Shakespearian 'Richard II' and Shakespeare's 'Henry IV', Part I* (*S. in Ph.*, April) is examined by John James Elson. This play, Egerton 1994 (*Thomas of Woodstock*), Elson thinks Shakespeare saw before writing *1 Henry IV*. He finds that, although it has small connexion with *Richard II*, it influenced the conception of Falstaff. J. M. Purcell writes on *The Date of '1 Henry IV'* (*N. and Q.*, June 1), with special reference to Gabriel Harvey's apparent allusions to it in 1592. In *Hotspur's Earthquake* (*M.L.N.*, March) Don Cameron Allen discusses *1 Henry IV*, III. i. 28–33,

²⁴ See *The Year's Work*, xiv. 182–3.

²⁵ See *The Year's Work*, xiv. 182.

²⁶ *Die Szenenführung in den Shakespeare'schen Historien: Ein Vergleich mit Holinshed und Hall*, von Karl Otto Braun. Würzburg, Richard Mayr. pp. 177.

²⁷ *King Richard the Second*, by A. E. M. Kirkwood. Adelaide, F. W. Preece. pp. 24.

and shows that the theory of imprisoned winds, although based on Plutarch and Pliny, was influenced by medieval ideas. *Nook-Shotten* in *Henry V* is provided with a note by Allen Mawer (*T.L.S.*, July 25). He draws attention to a place-name in Warwickshire which seems to show that the phrase signified 'running out into angles or corners'.

Miscellaneous notes are provided by Arnold Schröer in *Shakespeareana* (*Anglia*, July); these concern 'kind' in *Hamlet*, I. ii. 65, 'unbonneted' in *Othello*, I. ii. 23, and 'cadent' in *Lear*, I. iv. 307. *Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von Road bei Shakespeare* (*Anglia*, July) by Max Deutschbein carefully traces the origin and uses of the word up to and through Shakespeare's works.

The New Temple Shakespeare, edited by M. R. Ridley, and *The New Eversley Shakespeare*, under the general editorship of Guy Boas, both incorporate the results of modern textual research. George Skillan has edited *The Merchant of Venice* for acting purposes.²⁸ *Othello*, *Twelfth Night*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* have been added to the Sansoni Shakespeare.²⁹

Among the articles listed above several deal with stage problems. This subject is dealt with specifically in some other contributions. Theodore B. Hunt, reconstructing *The Scenes as Shakespeare saw them* (*Parrott Presentation Volume*, pp. 205-11), argues that many indications of place in modern texts are essentially false; as an example he demonstrates that the author thought of *Hamlet*, II. ii, not as 'A Room in the Castle', but as 'a lobby' or loggia out of doors. George William Small writes on *Shakspeare's Stage* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.); he would reject the evidence of the *Messalina* and *Roxana* prints.

The question of sources, likewise dealt with incidentally above, has occupied some special attention. Alwin Thaler, in a significant paper on *Shakespeare and Spenser* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), lays emphasis on the neglected indebtedness of the dramatist to the

²⁸ *The Merchant of Venice*, prepared with prompt notes and designs by George Skillan. French. 2s. 6d.

²⁹ *Otello . . . La Notte dell'Epifania . . . Sogno d'una notte d'estate* (translated by Raffaello Piccoli, Aurelio Zanco, and Giulia Celenza, respectively). Florence, Sansoni. Lire 12, 8, and 12.

poet. He succeeds in demonstrating a constant series of reminiscences, mostly of a subtle kind, which has caused them to escape the notice of those engaged in the pursuit of verbal echoes. In *The Influence of Seneca* (*ibid.*, July) Samuel A. Small shows what the English playwrights owed to their Roman predecessor: with this article may be associated an anonymous *Ghost Technique in Shakspere* (*ibid.*, July). T. W. Baldwin, providing *A Note upon William Shakespeare's Use of Pliny* (*Parrott Presentation Volume*, pp. 157-82), denies that the dramatist used Holland's version of the *Natural History* (1601). In a comment upon *Shakespeare, Lylly and 'Æsop'* (*N. and Q.*, May 5), H. W. Crundell discusses the use of a fable in *Endimion* and reminiscences of it in *2 Henry VI* and *Cymbeline*. W. B. Drayton Henderson writes on *Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida': yet deeper in its Tradition* (*Parrott Presentation Volume*, pp. 127-56); there he shows that, while Shakespeare drew from many sources, including Chaucer, Caxton, and Chapman, the most important source of all was Lydgate, who gave him not only facts but a characteristic approach. Even the word 'Degree', so important for an appreciation of the play, derived thence.

James G. McManaway has a note on '*Richard III*' on the Stage (*T.L.S.*, June 27); this play, he observes, must have been acted during the Restoration period, probably about 1684-5, the evidence deriving from a manuscript list of parts in a 1634 quarto owned by Quaritch. Montague Summers (*ibid.*, July 4) points out that this revival is dealt with in his *The Playhouse of Pepys*; he would date it between 1688 and 1690. An interesting study of *The Shakespearian Productions of John Philip Kemble* has been prepared by Harold Child.³⁰ This clearly and effectively sets forth Kemble's importance in the ranks of producers.

Elfriede Probst examines the influence of Shakespeare on Swinburne.³¹ *The Influence of Shakespeare on Smollett* is analysed by George Morrow Kahrl (*Parrott Presentation Volume*, pp. 399-420). Heinz Wohlers discusses some of the characteristic

³⁰ *The Shakespearian Productions of John Philip Kemble*, by Harold Child. O.U.P. for the Shakespeare Association. pp. 22. 2s.

³¹ *Der Einfluss Shakespeares auf der Stuart-Trilogie Swinburnes*, von Elfriede Probst. Diss., Munich, 1934. pp. 48.

tendencies in Dr. Johnson's notes on Shakespeare.³² Producing many parallels, Paul Steck has an interesting paper on *Schiller und Shakespeare* in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*. The same journal contains a note by H. von Langermann on *Ein Brief des Grafen Wolf Baudissin über die Vollendung der Schlegel-Tieckschen Shakespeare-Übersetzung*. Shakespeare's Sonnets in Germany forms the theme of an appreciative study by Ludwig W. Kahn.³³ In *Shakespeare and a Poor Swiss Peasant (Books Abroad, Autumn)* Roy Temple House draws attention to Ulrich Bräker, author of studies published many years later in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*. Tolstoi's attitude to the plays is dealt with by Rudolf Wassenberg.³⁴

The Comtesse de Chambrun has now issued in English her novel on Shakespeare's life.³⁵ The appearance of the French edition was noted in *The Year's Work*, xv. 180. A comment on the *T.L.S.* review of this book was contributed by the author to that journal on 14 March. Louis Mandin in *Shakespeare et les moutons savants (Mercure de France, June)* deals with various recent theories concerning Bacon and Derby. Mathias Mohardt in the same magazine (April)—*A la recherche de Shakespeare: L'identification de Malvolio*—takes Alwin Thaler's conjectural identification of Malvolio and William Ffarington as the basis for averring that the plays were written by William Stanley, sixth earl of Derby.

Mention should be made here of the various bibliographical aids to the study of Shakespearian literature. S. A. Tannenbaum's *Classified Bibliography*, 1934, appears in *S.A.B.* (Jan.). The *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* contains its familiar sections—the 'Bücherschau' by Wolfgang Keller, the 'Zeitschriften-

³² *Der persönliche Gehalt in den Shakespeare-Noten Samuel Johnsons*, von Heinz Wohlers. Bremen: Wohlers und Brickwedde. pp. 95.

³³ *Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland: Versuch einer literarischen Typologie*, von Ludwig W. Kahn. Bern and Leipzig: Gotthelf Verlag. pp. 122. RM. 4.

³⁴ *Tolstois Angriff auf Shakespeare: Ein Beitrag zur Charakterisierung östlichen und westlichen Schöpfertums*, von Rudolf Wassenberg. Düsseldorf, Dissertations-Verlag G. H. Nolte. pp. 45.

³⁵ *My Shakespeare, Rise! Recollections of John Lacy, one of His Majesty's Players*, by C. Longworth de Chambrun. With Preface by André Maurois. Stratford-on-Avon; Shakespeare Press: London; Lippincott. pp. xvi + 366. 7s. 6d.

schau' by Hubert Pollert and J. W. Kindervater, the 'Theaterschau' by E. L. Stahl and Erika Anders, besides the bibliography for 1932-3 by Anton Preis. In *A Stern'st Goodnight to Shakspere?* (*American Scholar*, Spring) William T. Hastings comments on the most important Shakespeare studies of 1933-4.

VIII

ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

By F. S. BOAS

Most of the 1935 publications in the field of Elizabethan Drama have been concerned with single playwrights or plays. But in *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*¹ M. C. Bradbrook deals with some important wider aspects of the subject. She seeks 'to show that beneath what may seem very arbitrary and trivial conventions there was an underlying unity which makes into parts of a coherent whole much that has seemed difficult to explain'. In this attempt 'the crucial question is the nature of Elizabethan dramatic speech', and the chapter on it 'forms the keystone' of her argument.

In Part I of her book, 'The Theatre', she begins by discussing conventions of presentation and acting, including locality, time, costume and stage effects, gesture and delivery, and grouping. From these she proceeds to what she calls 'conventions of acting', i.e. 'the plot in the Aristotelian sense, or narrative and character taken together'. It may be questioned whether the phrase is sufficiently explanatory, but Miss Bradbrook's analysis is illuminating, as in her distinction between cumulative plots, as in *Tamburlaine*, *Arden*, and *Macbeth*, and those involving peripeteia, as in Revenge tragedies; or in her classification of the three Elizabethan 'positive standards of characterization . . . the superhuman nature of heroes, the definition of characters by decorum, and the theory of Humours'. Miss Bradbrook, however, claims that the Elizabethans were less interested in narrative and characterization than in direct moral instruction and in the play of words or images. Their rhetorical school education prepared them for the appreciation of rhetorical dialogue on the stage, and Miss Bradbrook's illustrations of different varieties of this 'patterned speech' are of much interest. But the most vital part of her argument is that 'the recognition of direct speech as a legitimate convention is neces-

¹ *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, by M. C. Bradbrook. C.U.P. pp. viii + 275. 12s. 6d.

sary to the rehabilitation of Elizabethan methods of construction'. For her elaboration of this thesis and her illustration of the 'expository' and 'moral' uses of the soliloquy students must be referred to the book itself. In Part II, 'The Dramatists', Miss Bradbrook discusses how the conventions were handled respectively by Marlowe, Tourneur, Webster, Middleton, and the playwrights of 'the decadence', i.e. Beaumont and Fletcher, Ford, and Shirley. This assessment of Beaumont and Fletcher, as compared with Tourneur, is one of the numerous debatable points in a stimulating and attractively written volume.

In *Those Nut-Cracking Elizabethans*² W. J. Lawrence has gathered together fourteen of his 'scattered writings' dealing with the Elizabethan theatre and drama. The essay which gives the book its title, together with that on 'The Elizabethan Private Playhouse', were noticed, in *The Year's Work*, xi. 175, when they first appeared, and a number of the other studies have been discussed in other volumes of this annual survey. But students will be glad to have together in revised form, and with eight accompanying illustrations, essays on such subjects as 'Bells in Elizabethan Drama', 'The Evolution of the Tragic Carpet', and 'Bygone Stage Furniture and its Removers'. It is in these alluring theatrical by-paths that Lawrence has been so indefatigable and successful an explorer, not without a zest for a 'scrap' with similar wayfarers. Though he speaks in his preface of having entered upon his 'last lap', the note upon *The Site of the Whitefriars Theatre* in *R.E.S.* (April) shows that his activities are still 'in progress'.

Ethel Seaton's *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* falls within the scope of Chapter ix,³ but attention may here be drawn to Appendix I, 'References to Plays'. The extracts from diaries and letters of Danish students in England belong to the Restoration period, but they note performances of Elizabethan plays, including *Friar Bacon* and *Friar Bungay*, *The Alchemist*, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*,

² *Those Nut-Cracking Elizabethans: Studies of the Early Theatre and Drama*, by W. J. Lawrence. The Argonaut Press. pp. viii+212. 10s. 6d.

³ See pp. 249-50.

several of Beaumont and Fletcher's comedies, and the unidentified *The New-Made Nobleman*.

T. C. Macaulay's article on *French and English Drama in the Seventeenth Century* (*Essays and Studies*, vol. xx) is concerned chiefly with the Restoration period and is noticed in Chapter x (p. 268). But mention may be made here of the contrast which Macaulay emphasizes between the Elizabethan public stage with its protruding platform and restricted area and the roomier French stage, which retained the multiple setting of the period of the Mysteries.

A leading article on *Pastoral Plays* (*T.L.S.*, Sept. 5) deals with the development of out-of-door drama from Miracle Plays to modern pageants and the open-air theatre in Regent's Park. In the Elizabethan period, with regard to the pageants presented during the royal progresses, it is pointed out that 'the significance of the site had now become an essential part of the scheme'. On the other hand, Shakespearian pastoral plays 'were not intended to be framed in the nature with which they are instinct', and the Masques 'despite their pastoral and sylvan repertory . . . were essentially indoor shows dependent on scenic mechanisms'.

B. R. Pearson makes a valuable survey of *Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.). He deals with fifty-seven plays, from *Gorboduc* in 1562 to Massinger's *Roman Actor* in 1626, containing a total of over 120 dumb-shows. Four of the plays fall within 1561–70; none within 1571–80; four within 1581–90; thirteen within 1591–1600; sixteen within 1601–10; fourteen within 1611–20; and six within 1621–30. It is remarkable, as Pearson points out, that so far as extant plays are concerned, there is a gap of about twenty years between dumb-show in *Appius and Virginia* (1567) and its reappearance in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur*. Thenceforward it continued to be popular for about forty years. From his detailed analysis Pearson concludes that its general aim was to provide the audience with incident and spectacle, but that its particular purpose varied at different periods.

'It may provide a symbolical comment on the theme of the play,

it may provide a convenient means of representing dreams and visions, it may fulfil the function of a prologue or scene of the ordinary type, or it may be a means of placing characters in the required position on the stage without the delay caused by spoken acting.'

E. P. Vandiver, Jr., in the *Elizabethan Dramatic Parasite* (*S. in Ph.*, July) sketches the development of the type from Merygreeke in *Roister Doister* to Sueno and Helga in Shirley's *The Politician*. He stresses the point that 'the parasite of Elizabethan drama is primarily a composite product'. He traces the various elements that went to his composition, from the classical parasite, the Vice of the Moralities, the Italian parasite of the *commedia erudita* and the *commedia dell'arte*, and the parasite of the Teutonic school drama, in which he 'was regarded as a very opprobrious character'. Vandiver would have been well advised to keep his examples within these limits instead of stretching his net to include such figures as Falstaff, Iago, and Sejanus, who cannot profitably be brought within his designation.

In *Logic in the Elizabethan Drama* (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) Allan H. Gilbert starts from the basis that 'logic in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries still occupied a prominent place in the university study and in the estimation of scholars and men of intellect' and that 'logical method and the vocabulary of logic must have been familiar to all who had been at the university and to many who had not'. It is, therefore, not surprising that dramatists so often assumed that their audiences would appreciate passages of dialogue involving the use of terms or methods of formal logic. In the comedies of the period the scholar and the logician are often identified and are usually unpractised in the ways of the world. But from Lyly onwards logical forms and dialectic are put into the mouths also of characters who have had no academic training. Logical argumentation has its place too in tragedy, as in the instances quoted by Gilbert from *Sophonisba*, *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*; and, as he concludes, 'the drama rendered its tribute to a great logician when Marlowe in *The Massacre at Paris* presented the murder of Peter Ramus'.

In *Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Play Manuscripts* (P.M.L.A., Sept.) Alfred Harbage provides a valuable list of the relevant manuscripts from 1558 to 1700, with the exception of the numerous Latin plays of the period. He lists in succession (1) plays by known authors from Francis Bacon to Richard Zouch, (2) plays of which the authors are unknown, (3) anonymous plays without titles. In nearly every case the present location of the manuscripts is given, with 'autograph' or 'holograph' appended when there is evidence of this.

Harbage justifiably states that he excludes comments on such much discussed plays as *Sir Thomas More*, but even so one scarcely expects to find it simply listed under 'authors unknown', without any cross-reference to Munday, Chettle, or Shakespeare. As Latin plays are omitted, it would have been well in the case of *The Christmas Prince* to specify which of the pieces in it are English, in addition to *Periander*, of which the author is now known (see below, p. 204). And in the final note on 'unlocated manuscripts' it is not made clear that the Collier fragment of *The Massacre at Paris* is now in the Folger library. But these are minor points in a scholarly and helpful catalogue.

Giles E. Dawson's article on *An Early List of Elizabethan Plays* (R.E.S., Mar.) is noticed below in Chapter xiv (p. 351). But attention may be drawn here to a few points of wider interest. Henry Oxinden's collection of plays (presumably here catalogued) contained a copy of *Roister Doister* which he lent on 18 October 1665, to 'Sr Basil'. He does not give the date as he does for many of the plays when it is on the title-page, including seventeen of the nineteen plays in the section where *Roister Doister* is listed. This suggests that even if the title-page of the unique copy in the Eton library had been preserved it would be without the date. Oxinden lived near Canterbury and showed a strong interest in Marlowe in his commonplace book (see p. 207). It is curious that though he had copies of *Dido* and *Edward II* (1598 edition) distinguished by a marginal pointing hand, he does not mention *Tamburlaine* or *Dr. Faustus* either in its earlier or later forms. But fortunately he gives the date of his copy of *Hamlet* as 1603.

Dawson comments on the mystery of the seeming disappear-

ance of the plays in Oxinden's collection, only one of which, *Selimus*, with 'Hen: Oxinden' written on the title-page, has found its way to the Folger Library.

Another mysterious disappearance of Elizabethan works is recorded by W. G. Hiscock in *The Christ Church Missing Books* (*T.L.S.*, June 20). As no plays are included a detailed notice of this remarkable article would not be in place here, but no student of Elizabethan drama can be uninterested in the diverse fortunes of the ten pamphlets of Greene, the three of Nashe, and the copy of Gosson's *The Schoole of Abuse*, which were abstracted from the Christ Church library, Oxford, between 1833 and 1848.

On the other hand the present writer was able to give news in *T.L.S.*, July 4, of *A Lost and Found Volume of Manuscript Plays*. This was the volume of seven manuscript plays from the library of W. G. Lambarde sold by Messrs. Hodgson on 19 June 1924 and which for a time could not be traced. It is now in the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington. It includes among its more important contents, *Hengist, King of Kent*, a variant version of Middleton's *The Mayor of Quinborough*, Arthur Wilson's *The Inconstant Lady*, and an anonymous comedy without a title. Bernard M. Wagner in *T.L.S.*, July 11, identifies this comedy as a first or early version, apparently autograph, of Sir William Lower's *Enchanted Lovers*. In the same letter Wagner draws attention to manuscript copies in the Folger Library of S. Brooke's *Melanthe*; the anonymous academic play *Cancer*; the St. John's, Oxford, *Periander*, with the hitherto unknown name of the author, John Sansbury; John Wilson's *Belphegor*, a prompt copy; and Charles Johnson's *Force of Friendship*, with Killigrew's conditional licence and the prompter's annotations.

In *The Authorship of 'The Christmas Prince'* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) Alfred Harbage deals more fully with the manuscript of *Periander* in the Folger Library. It has on its title-page the entry 'made bye Mr John Sansburye', a Master of Arts of St. John's College and Vicar of St. Giles, who was assessed at ten shillings for the maintenance of the Prince and his household. Harbage

compares the Folger MS. of *Periander* with that at St. John's, and notes that the former 'contains only a rudimentary drama-tis personae, and no induction' and omits about 60 lines. On the other hand it has three lines omitted apparently by accident from the Oxford MS. Other minor differences are also noted.

Harbage suggests that as Sansbury was author of *Ilium in Italianam*, which contains reproductions and explanations in Latin hexameters of the arms of the various colleges, that it was he who projected 'The triumph of all the founders of the Colledges in Oxford', which there was not time to carry out (ll. 9292-5); and that he wrote *Somnium fundatoris*, acted on 10 January 1608, but not included in the St. John's MS. because, owing to the author's death, it 'not long after was lost'. But Sansbury did not die till January 1610, and as *Periander* was preserved, why not this interlude?

Harbage further points out that bound up with *Periander* are the following dramatic manuscripts: *Risus Anglicanus* (Latin); *A Christmas Messe*, 1619; *Heterocitanonalaonomia* (English), 1613; *Gigantomachia, or Worke for Jupiter* (English); and Jonson's *Christmas his Showe*, 1615.

In *Fatum Vortigerni* (*T.L.S.*, Aug. 15) William K. McCabe makes known the authorship of another academic play (MS. Lansdowne 723), and shows that it is of Douai origin. In the Douai Diaries, under 22 August 1619, there is the entry of the performance 'a nostris publice magno cum applausu' of *Fatum Vortigerni* by Thomas Carleton, professor of Rhetoric. McCabe adds that 'the whole treatment of the Vortigern-Roxina situation is a transparent Catholic commentary on that of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn'. Carleton is further recorded as the author of a Latin play on Henry VIII himself (10 Oct. 1623), and of another on Emma, Queen of England, and mother of Hardicanute (8 Sept. 1620).

A publication of 1934, *Godes Peace and the Queenes*, by Norreys J. O'Conor,⁴ was not noticed last year, as it is pri-

⁴ *Godes Peace and the Queenes: Vicissitudes of a House*, 1539-1615, by Norreys Jephson O'Conor. O.U.P. 1934. pp. vi+154.

marily a history of the Norreys family in Tudor times. But it includes in Part vi an otherwise unknown account of an interlude composed by Talboys Dymoke, who also acted in it. It was performed on Sunday, 31 August 1601, at South Kyme in Lincolnshire and was called 'the death of the lord of Kyme because the same daye should make an ende of the Sommer Lord game in South Kyme for that yeare'. In the play Dymoke counterfeited his uncle, the Earl of Lincoln, who was 'fetcht awaie by . . . the Dylvill'. There was also a Vice who bequeathed his wooden dagger to the Earl. A Latin dirge was sung, and after the interlude one John Cradock uttered from a pulpit a profane prayer and 'reade a text out of the book of Mabb'.

The Earl of Lincoln took proceedings in the Star Chamber against the offenders, and though they disputed most of the charges against them they were sentenced in 1610 to severe penalties, though Talboys Dymoke had died previously.

In the publications on individual dramatists Marlowe figures less conspicuously in 1935 than during recent years. But in *Marlowe in Kentish Tradition* (*N. and Q.*, July 13, 20, 27, Aug. 24) Mark Eccles gives important support to manuscript memoranda concerning him which have been called in question. These memoranda, partly in cipher, are in a copy of *Hero and Leander* (1629) included in the sale of Richard Heber's library in 1834. They were transcribed at the time of the sale by J. W. Burgon, who passed on his version to Joseph Hunter. The salient points are as follow:

Feb. 10, 1640. Mr Alscrit saies that Marloe was an Atheist, and wrote a book against the Scriptures, how that it was all one mans making; and would have printed it, but it could not be suffered to be printed. He was a rare scholar, and made excellent verses in Latin. He died aged about 30.

Marloe was stabbed with a dagger, and died swearing. Marloe had a friend named Phineaux at Dover, whom he made an Atheist, but who was made to recant. . . . This Phineaux had all Marloe by heart.

There is also on the reverse of the title a Latin Epitaph on Sir Roger Manwood by Marlowe.

J. P. Collier gave a similar, though less full, account of the memoranda in the catalogue of the Heber library and first

printed the epitaph on Manwood in the introduction to his edition of Shakespeare (1844). They have therefore been queried by some critics and editors, including Tucker Brooke, as Collier forgeries, though the existence of the volume containing them has been verified as late as 1917, when it passed through the hands of P. J. Dobell.

Eccles is now able to show that the memoranda and epitaph were on record two centuries before the Heber sale. Henry Oxinden, the collector of plays (see p. 203), on the fly-leaf of his commonplace book and, with slight variations, on f. 42, wrote the epitaph on Manwood, twelve Latin hexameters 'made by Christopher Marlo'. He quoted in this book, now in the Folger Library, lines from *Hero and Leander* and *Edward II*, and reported there remarks made by 'Mr. Aldrich' about Marlowe, which are substantially equivalent to the memoranda in the Heber copy of *Hero and Leander*. They are also found, with some variations in another of Oxinden's commonplace books (B.M. Add. MS. 28012).

Mr. Aldrich (incorrectly deciphered by Burgon as 'Alscrit') was Simon Aldrich, member of a Canterbury family. Eccles points out that he had gone up to Cambridge, Trinity College, about the time of Marlowe's death, for he took his B.A. in 1596/7. He was a scholar and afterwards fellow of Trinity, and before becoming a tenant and neighbour of Oxinden, he had been vicar of Ringmer, Sussex. Mr. Phineux, or Fineux, of Dover seems to have been Thomas Fineux, who matriculated at Marlowe's college, Corpus Christi, in 1587, the year in which the poet took his M.A. Thus through Oxinden a well-authenticated tradition leads back to Marlowe's own time and surroundings in Kent and Cambridge.

F. B. Williams, Jun., in *Ingram Frizer* (*T.L.S.*, Aug. 15) adds something to our knowledge of the man who slew the dramatist. He points out that Frizer seems to have been related by birth or marriage to the Chamberlains of Kingsclere, Hants, among whom the uncommon Christian name Ingram is found. Andrew Chamberlain, citizen and draper of London, left by his will (proved 10 June 1602) four pounds and also forty shillings for black cloth to Ingram Frizer. Andrew's brother-in-law, Sir

James Deane, also a citizen and draper, was even more generous to Frizer. By his will (proved 13 June 1608) he left him twenty pounds and 'so much black cloth as will make him a cloake', and forgave him a debt of five pounds. He was apparently the James Deane to whom Frizer had sold the Angel Inn in Basingstoke in 1589.

In *The 'Senseless Lure' Problem* (*T.L.S.*, July 18) J. G. Flynn defends the reading in *Tamburlaine*, Part I, Act III. iii. 158, as found in the first, second, and fourth editions:

And make our strokes to wound the sencelesse lure

He holds that 'the expression is used in a metaphysical fashion referring to the enemy as a senseless lure enticing Tamburlaine to his capture', and that 'sencelesse' has the double meaning of 'incapable of sensation', and of 'devoid of intelligence'.

In Peele's '*Decensus Astraeae*' and Marlowe's '*Edward II*' (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) Arthur M. Sampley points out that line 39 in *Decensus Astraeae*, 'In peace triumphant, fortunate in wars', occurs also in *Edward II*, l. 1416. As Peele's poem was written for 29 October 1591 the question whether he or Marlowe was the borrower has a bearing on the date of the play.

In *Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe* (*M.L.N.*, June) M. P. Tilley and James K. Ray state that hitherto six proverbs have been identified in *The Jew of Malta* and one in *Edward II*. They proceed to add three in *Dido*, one in *I Tamburlaine*, four in *II Tamburlaine*, four in *Doctor Faustus*, eleven in *The Jew of Malta*, eight in *Edward II*, and four in *Hero and Leander*. 'Marlowe's employment of proverbs is confined mainly to those "old truths" in which his characters find support for their views or comfort for their woes.' The significance of 'proverb' needs some stretching to cover all their examples, but the article with its numerous parallels from contemporary works is of value to students of Marlowe.

In Greene's '*Ridstall Man*' (*M.L.R.*, July) Herbert G. Wright supports W. L. Renwick's conjecture (*M.L.R.*, Oct. 1934) that when Bohun, in Greene's *James the Fourth*, is described as 'attyred like a ridstall man', Redesdale is meant. In William

Bullen's *Dialogue . . . against the Feuer Pestilence* a beggar who tells that he was born in Redesdale in Northumberland is taken by a southern woman to be 'a Scot by thy tongue', and uses northern dialect forms.

In Kyd's *Borrowing from Garnier's 'Bradamante'* (M.L.N., March) Marion Grubb points out that the lines in *Soliman and Perseda*, I. iii. 79–81, 112–13; IV. ii. 7 'sooth to say, the earth is my country, &c.' are strikingly parallel to a passage in Garnier's play, *Bradamante* (1582), II. 580–3, 587–9, and appear to have been taken from it.

In *A Brace of Villains* (*ibid.*) Miss Grubb similarly points out resemblances between the thief described by Bradshaw in *Arden of Feversham*, II. i. 49 ff., and Malengin in *The Faerie Queene*, V. ix. 10 ff. She infers that the author of *Arden* (1592), whether Kyd or another, had seen the Spenserian lines, published in 1596, in manuscript before 1592. This seems highly speculative.

In *Ghosts and Guides: Kyd's 'Spanish Tragedy' and the Medieval Tragedy* (M.P., Aug.) Howard Baker maintains that the Ghost of Andrea and his companion, Revenge, who form the Chorus to Kyd's play, are not derived directly from Seneca but from 'stock characters in the medieval metrical "tragedies"'. He compares the parts played by Sorrow in Sackville's 'Induction' to *The Mirror for Magistrates* and by the Ghost, greedy for revenge, in 'The Complaint of Buckingham'. He claims that 'whatever the connections with the classics may be, ghosts, revenge, and allegoric figures—the features of Kyd's drama—were thoroughly embedded in English literature well before Kyd's day'.

A scholarly and fully documented study of Ben Jonson's reputation and theatrical fortunes for more than a century after the Restoration is provided by Robert G. Noyes in *Ben Jonson on the English Stage, 1660–1776*.⁵ After a preliminary chapter on 'Main Currents in the Criticism of Ben Jonson'

⁵ *Ben Jonson on the English Stage*, by Robert Gale Noyes. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. (Harvard Studies in English, XVII.) pp. x+351. 15s.

during the period under review, Noyes deals in separate chapters with the theatrical history of six of the plays, beginning with *Volpone* which 'to modern poets and dramatists . . . has seemed the consummate achievement of Jonson's genius'. He notes the revivals of the play not only to 1776 but to 1785, at Drury Lane, and, after an interval of 136 years, the production by the Phoenix Society in 1921, followed by performances in Cambridge, New York (Stefan Zweig's version), and Malvern.

The stage-history of *The Alchemist* is even more remarkable. It was acted oftener than any other of Jonson's plays, and by a freak of theatrical fortune Abel Drugger came to be regarded as the 'star' part. From the first appearance of Garrick as the tobacconist on 21 March 1743 'the history of *The Alchemist* became virtually the history of Abel Drugger'. In the next twenty years Garrick played the role sixty-four times. His stage-version of *The Alchemist* omitted over 900 lines and, as Noyes states, ruined the role of Sir Epicure Mammon. But it was not a mere travesty of the original as was Francis Gentleman's farce, *The Tobacconist*, in which Weston appeared as Drugger at the Haymarket in October 1770, and had no less a successor than Edmund Kean in 1815.

Epicoene was apparently the first play to be performed, about 6 June 1660, after the return of Charles II on 25 May, and its history is traced till its production at Drury Lane in Colman's version in January 1776. *Bartholomew Fair* had frequent revivals till 1722, after which it disappeared almost completely from the play-bills. *Every Man in his Humour*, on the other hand, had no great vogue in the Restoration period, but had a remarkably prolonged success after its revival by Garrick, in his own version, on 29 November 1751. The last recorded performance of *Catiline* was on 8 March 1675, but in 1691 Langbaine states that the play was still in vogue on the stage. A chronological list of performances of Jonson's plays, 1660–1776, completes a volume for which students of Ben will be grateful.

A useful pendant to Noyes's book is G. J. Ten Hoor's article, *Ben Jonson's Reception in Germany* (*P.Q.*, Oct.). Ten Hoor notes that the English comedians who introduced into Germany

late in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth centuries the plays of early English dramatists and of Shakespeare did not bring with them a single comedy by Jonson. The first of his plays to be seen there was *Sejanus*, acted in a German translation at Heidelberg, some time between 1663 and 1671, by members of the court of the Prince Elector. It was not till about a century later that Lessing, in 1758, and more fully in March 1768 (in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*) initiated the German public into Jonsonian humours. In 1771 Gerstenberg published a translation of some scenes from *Epicoene*. In 1800 Tieck, whose study of Jonson began in 1792, published a translation of the whole play. He had already adapted *Volpone*, and by 1817 he 'had worked through Jonson's complete writings three times, carefully, diligently, and thoroughly'. The attitude of Goethe, Baudissin, and A. W. Schlegel to Jonson is discussed, and Ten Hoor sums up by stating that except for Lessing, 'the value of studying Jonson lay, for the Germans solely, in the light which he might cast upon the work and genius of Shakespeare'.

The relation of Jonson and Shakespeare in the eyes of another eminent German critic is the leading theme in Harvey W. Hewett-Thayer's scholarly article on *Tieck and the Elizabethan Drama: his Marginalia* (*J.E.G.P.*, July). Ludwig Tieck had copies of the 1692 Folio of Jonson and Gifford's nine-volume edition, 1816; also of Collier's *History of English Dramatic Poetry* and Hazlitt's *Lectures on the Dramatic Poetry of the Age of Elizabeth*. These are now in the British Museum with notes in his own handwriting which have been examined by Hewett-Thayer. These notes show a remarkable knowledge of Elizabethan drama, but those in the Folio and the Gifford edition of Jonson display an animus against Ben, mainly due to Tieck's resolve 'to defend Shakespeare's pre-eminence in all respects and at all costs' against 'the suggestion that any other dramatist approaches or even resembles the great master'. To his general tone of depreciation the chief exception is his estimate of *Bartholomew Fair*, 'mir . . . ohne Frage das Liebste von B. J.' Similarly in his notes in the Collier and Hazlitt volumes he is always on the watch to dissent from any judgement concerning other dramatists, e.g. Marlowe, Fletcher, or

Webster, which seems to him to impair in any way the supremacy of Shakespeare.

How different is the atmosphere in *Rev. Ang.-Amér.* (Oct.), where Floris Delattre writes an appreciative notice of André Brûlé as a preface to the latter's posthumous article, *Sur Ben Jonson*. Brûlé died on 2 October 1934, and among his papers this seemed the most suitable for publication in the *Revue* of which he had been editor. It was suggested by a performance at 'l'Atelier' in Paris of a French translation by Jules Romains of Stefan Zweig's German version of *Volpone*. Brûlé felt that in various important points this misrepresented Jonson's play. He gives a sketch of Ben, 'classique, moraliste, satiriste aussi, et satiriste amer, parce qu'il était observateur', and of his other chief comedies. But *Volpone* is, in his eyes, Jonson's masterpiece, and he bewails the loss in the adaptation of its 'grandeur', its 'caractère balzacien', its 'poésie'. To illustrate the rhythm of its verse he translates into French two speeches in Act III by Mosca and by Celia.

In *Two Notes on Ben Jonson* (*T.L.S.*, Feb. 14) George Burke Johnston calls attention to two manuscript entries in a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century hand in a copy of volume i of the 1640 Folio of Jonson's works in his possession. The first note is 'an extempore Epilogue spoken by Ben Jonson upon one of his plays [*Catiline*] being ill received'. It consists of four lines, with a similar double rhyme, and seems to be not otherwise known. The second note is an Epitaph 'made by Fletcher for him, over a glass of wine in his company'. The four-lined epitaph is a variant of one reported by Drummond and Archdeacon Plume. The latter ascribes his version to Shakespeare. The above manuscript note is the only evidence for Fletcher's authorship.

In a letter on *Dicing Fly* and '*The Alchemist*' (*T.L.S.*, June 27), Hope Emily Allen draws attention to two contemporary passages, noted by L. S. Powell (see *T.L.S.*, Aug. 1), which throw light on Jonson's use of 'fly' in *The Alchemist* to denote 'a familiar demon that can be bought and sold'. Robert

Parsons in 1601 describes how Adam Squire, afterwards Master of Balliol, was known for 'certayne deceyts used to some countreymen of his in selling them dycing flies'. A more detailed account of the episode with a similar use of 'fly' is found in a letter written by a brother of Parsons, probably in 1612.

In *Title-Page Mottoes in the Poetomachia* (*S. in Ph.*, April) Robert Boies Sharpe examines the Latin quotations in the title-pages of the plays concerned in the 'War of the Theatres', from the 1600 quarto of *Every Man out of his Humour* to the 1602 quartos of *The Poetaster* and *Satiromastix*. He sheds light on the implications of these mottoes by setting them in their original contexts. And he carries on beyond the Poetomachia period the examination of similar mottoes from Latin authors on later title-pages of Jonson and Dekker.

In *The Undated Quarto of I Honest Whore* (*Library*, Sept.) Hazelton Spencer reports that a second copy (imperfect) of the undated quarto of Dekker's play, whose whereabouts was unknown to W. W. Greg (see *Library*, June 1934), is in the Folger Library. Spencer's chronology of the earliest editions runs: Q 1, 1604; Q 2 (n.d.) 1604–5 (corrected); Q 3, 1605 (hybrid).

In a letter to *T.L.S.*, Feb. 7, on *Bullen's Beaumont and Fletcher* D. M. McKeitham reports that copies of the first two volumes of the incompletely Variorum edition, recently acquired by the library of the University of Texas, apparently belonged to P. A. Daniel, who edited *The Maid's Tragedy*, *Philaster*, and *The Beggar's Bush*. Inserted in volume i were copies of correspondence relating to the uncompleted edition between Bullen, Daniel, and the publishers, George Bell and Sons. There was also a letter from K. Deighton to Daniel, containing some notes on *The Maid's Tragedy* and *Philaster*. There are also thirteen notes written in pencil or ink by Daniel on these two plays in volume i.

In an article *On Six Plays in 'Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679'* (*R.E.S.*, July) R. Warwick Bond collects gleanings on sources, date, and authorship from his unpublished editions of six plays prepared for the above named uncompleted Variorum edition of the two dramatists. He traces the historical source of *The*

Double Marriage to Thomas Danett's translation (1596) of the *Memoires* of Philip de Comines, Book vii, chaps. 11–14. He divides the play between Fletcher and Massinger. In *The Maid in the Mill* by Fletcher and W. Rowley he finds 'frank imitation' of *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Winter's Tale*. The chief source of the main action of *Love's Cure* Bond found in *La Fuerza de la Costumbre*, a comedy by Guillen de Castro, of which he gives a précis. A subsidiary source is the Spanish romance *Gerardo*, translated by L. Digges. On grounds which he sets forth Bond assigns the play to Massinger and Middleton. In *The Night-Walker*, licensed by Herbert as 'Fletcher's corrected by Shirley', Bond finds little to distinguish Shirley precisely. *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*, on metrical evidences, he would date 1618–22, and he finds resemblances in it to *Lysistrata*. For *The Noble Gentleman* Bond finds suggestions in *Hamlet* and *Don Quixote*, translated by Shelton 1612. He would date it 1613–16, written by Beaumont and Fletcher, and revised in 1626, perhaps by Middleton.

Two of the plays discussed by Bond are also dealt with by Baldwin Maxwell. In *The Date of Fletcher's 'The Night-Walker'* (M.L.N., Dec.) he notes the mention in Act III. iii. of 'Tom-a-Lincoln', the great bell of Lincoln Cathedral, which was first rung on 27 January 1610–11. On the ground that this allusion would be most apt soon after this date, Maxwell is inclined to place the play in 1611.

In *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed* (Mod. Phil., May) Maxwell uses a similar allusion to 'Tom o' Lincoln', Act III. ii, together with a reference to 'the North-East passage', Act II. i, as the chief arguments for a date early in 1611 rather than 1604 on account of references to the rebellion of Tyrone and the siege of Ostend. Owing to the English setting of *The Woman's Prize*, and the description of Petruchio's married life with a far from fully tamed first wife, Maxwell holds that '*The woman's prize* was originally not a studied continuation or an answer to *The taming of the shrew*', and that either Fletcher knew the older play slightly or added later the passages which glance back at it.

In *John Fletcher's Autograph* (P.Q., Oct.) W. W. Greg makes

some additional observations on the question whether Fletcher's letter to the Countess of Huntingdon is holograph (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 201).

P. V. Kreider's monograph on character conventions in Chapman's comedies⁶ begins with a somewhat exaggerated protest against 'the customary adverse criticism of his plays' and ends with some general notes on his life and writings. But it is in substance a detailed discussion of his technique as exemplified in his handling of a number of traditional comedy devices and types. Thus a dozen variations are noted of the ways in which Chapman's *dramatis personae* directly characterize themselves to the audience or are interpreted before or after their appearance by other speakers. The management of disguised characters is shown to take different forms in *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria*, *May-Day*, and *The Widow's Tears*. Conventional comic characters are divided by Kreider somewhat arbitrarily into two groups, domestic figures and figures from the street. Among the domestic figures is the Pantalone, the old man in love. Kreider examines some of Chapman's variations of the type, including Labervele in *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, who for the most part is the ridiculous puppet of Italian comedy, but in his relations with his son is 'an appealing, pitiable, somewhat realistic figure'. But the Pantalone more usually has a daughter who circumvents him in making her own choice of a husband; her most attractive impersonation is Margaret in *The Gentleman Usher*. Among the so-called 'figures from the street' are the braggart soldier, the pedant, and the gull, and Chapman's modifications of these are illustrated respectively from Quintiliano in *May-Day*, Sarpego in *The Gentleman Usher*, and D'Olive in *Monsieur D'Olive*. Kreider's conclusion is that 'his late personages show a modification, a humanizing, a release from such strict confines of tradition as hampered his earlier creations'.

But probably to a number of readers the most novel part of the treatise will be the chapter which illustrates the relation of

⁶ *Elizabethan Comic Character Conventions as revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman*, by Paul V. Kreider. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press. pp. xi + 206. \$2.50.

Chapman's characterization to the psychology and physiology of his day. Here the quotations from Burton's *Anatomy*, Bright's *A Treatise of Melancholy*, and Coeffeteau's *A Table of Humane Passions*, help us to a more precise understanding of passages in the plays which might be taken as merely metaphorical. Appendixes and a bibliography complete this favourable example of a characteristically Transatlantic doctoral thesis.

*The Parrott Presentation Volume*⁷ includes *Ethics in the Jacobean Drama: the Case of Chapman*, by Hardin Craig (pp. 25–46); *Political Theory in the Plays of George Chapman*, by Charles W. Kennedy (pp. 73–86); and *Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Giles Overreach* (pp. 276–87).

Rudolf Kirk's edition of *The City-Madam*,^{7a} which continues the series of Princeton and Bryn Mawr studies of Massinger's plays, was not available for notice last year. His text of the comedy is based upon the copy of the quarto, dedicated to 'Mr. Lee, Esquire', in the University of Chicago library, which has been collated with several other copies showing variations, and with later editions from Dodsley (1744) to Symons (1887). Kirk's emendations of what is on the whole a good text have been sparing, though for metrical reasons the lineation has been altered in a number of cases, including six which are new.

In his introduction he is inclined to date the play, which was licensed on 25 May 1632, on account of the character of the sartorial references, not later than from 1624 to 1626. He regards it as certain that the quarto was printed from an acting copy, but as yet unproven that this was in Massinger's hand. From a comparison between the initial 'T' and the headpiece over the first page in *The City-Madam* with a similar 'T' in *Amadis de Gaule*, printed by Jane Bell in 1652, and the headpiece in her edition of *King Lear* (1655), Kirk shows conclusively that Jane Bell was the printer of the quarto. The identity of the actor, Andrew Pennycuicke, and of the various patrons to whom he dedicated different copies of the quarto is discussed. But the larger part of Kirk's introduction consists of an account

⁷ See pp. 184–5.

^{7a} *The City-Madam: a Comedy by Philip Massinger*, ed. by Rudolf Kirk. Princeton Univ. Press and O.U.P. 1934. pp. vii+183. \$2.00, 9s.

of later editions and translations of *The City-Madam* and, in somewhat disproportionate detail, of the adaptations of the play. These include the anonymous eighteenth-century manuscript version, *The Cure of Pride*, now in the Huntington library; *Riches: or, The Wife and Brothers* by Sir James Burges (1810), in which both Macready and Edmund Kean appeared as Luke; and an adaptation, with the original title, at Sadler's Wells in 1844–5, in which Samuel Phelps played Luke. Kirk's scholarly edition of *The City-Madam* also includes Notes, in which special attention is given to sartorial, local, and astronomical references, and a Bibliography.

In *The Printer's Copy for the 'City-Madam'* (M.L.N., March) A. K. McIlwraith brings some new evidence to support his statement in R.E.S. vii. 206 that Massinger's play was printed from a manuscript which was most likely in his autograph. He quotes some characteristic spellings and two printers' errors which might well have arisen from his tricks of writing.

In *A Further Patron of 'The City Madam'* (Bodleian Quarterly Record, viii, no. 85) McIlwraith notes that in a 1658 copy of the play recently acquired by the Bodleian the patron is Richard Steadwel, Esquire.

In *Middleton's Acquaintance with the 'Merrie Conceited Jests of George Peele'* (P.M.L.A., Sept.) Mildred Gayler Christian claims the *Merrie Conceited Jests* (1607) as a source of *The Puritan* (1607), *Your Five Gallants* (n.d.), and *A Mad World, My Masters*. She assigns the three plays to Middleton and inclines to the view that they were composed within a few months of one another. She describes a number of parallel situations in the Jest-book and the plays, especially the two first named, and finds here additional support for Middleton's authorship of *The Puritan*.

The Contemporary Significance of Middleton's 'Game at Chesse' is discussed by John Robert Moore in the same number of P.M.L.A. He claims to identify in the picture on the title-page of Quartos 1 and 2 not only the Kings of England and Spain, Gondomar, and the Bishop of Spalato, but the two Queens,

Archbishop, Abbot, Olivarez, Buckingham, and Prince Charles. Middleton, according to Moore, could not have written the introductory poem, which shows ignorance of the rudiments of chess. This game instead of cards was chosen by the dramatist for allegorical use because the best chess-players of the time were Spaniards or Italian subjects of the Spanish King, like Greco, who lived in England from 1622 to 1624. After going into details of the allegory Moore suggests that it was probably Buckingham who influenced Herbert to license the play, to prevent Gondomar's return to England and to fan the popular feeling against Spain.

Bernard Wagner in '*A Middleton Forgery*' (P.Q., July) shows that a manuscript note in a copy of *A Game at Chesse* in the South Kensington Museum is not a forgery as S. Tannenbaum has argued. The rhymed 'petition' in the note appears also in two manuscript poetical miscellanies of the second quarter of the seventeenth century, Rawl. poet. 152, fol. 3, and Douce, f. 5, fol. 22 v.

The Malone Society Reprints of the two parts of *If you Know not Me, you Know Nobody*,⁸ belonging formally to 1934, are dated 1935. They have been prepared by Madeleine Doran in consultation with the General Editor. The eight editions of Part I between 1605 and 1639 are anonymous, but the eighth edition included a prologue and epilogue which had appeared in Thomas Heywood's *Dialogues and Dramas* (1637). 'Their inclusion in the edition of 1639 is *prima facie* evidence that it is to the present play that they belong, and in that case there can be no doubt that Thomas Heywood was at least part-author of *If you Know not Me, you Know Nobody*.' Its identity with 'the Play of Queene Elizabeth' in the heading to the Prologue in the *Dialogues and Dramas* is accepted by the Malone editors, but they give reasons for doubting whether Heywood was referring to the form in which it has come to us.

In the Prologue Heywood claimed that he had corrected for revival at the Cockpit a corrupt text printed without his consent.

⁸ *If you Know not Me, you Know Nobody*, Part I. pp. xxvii+six collotypes+A³-G³. Part II. pp. li+five collotypes+A²-K+Appendix. Ed. by Madeleine Doran and W. W. Greg (Malone Society Reprints).

The Malone editors point out that Q 8 does not justify such a claim, for the revision, 'though extensive, is superficial and perfunctory'. Whether Heywood or another was the reviser, the 1639 version 'is itself derivative and can provide no standard of comparison to assist in determining the nature of origin of the bad text printed in 1605'. Heywood declared concerning this text-book:

some by Stenography drew
The plot: put it in print (scarce one word trew).

The interpretation to be put on these words and the recent theory that the play was at least partly reconstructed from memory by some of the actors (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 214) are discussed, and also the relation of the play to *Sir Thomas Wyatt*.

The relation of the four editions of Part II (1606, 1609, 1623, and 1633) is considered. Q 1 presents a tolerably good text, and the changes and emendations in Q 2 and Q 3 do not provide evidence of recourse to any other authority. Q 4 contains a number of arbitrary alteration of readings, though one group of changes is due to an attempt to remove vulgarity and profanity. It also includes a different and longer version of the Armada scenes. The various possible solutions of the complex problem presented by the two versions are set forth; parallel texts of those portions of the Armada scenes that are comparable follow the Introduction, and the text of the 1633 version of these scenes is appended to the reprint. Finally, the Malone editors, as 'a tentative suggestion', give an outline of what may have been the history of the whole play. They have, in any case, provided the fullest materials for any later theories.

The controversy on the authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy* has been resumed in 1935. In *Tourneur and Mr. T. S. Eliot* (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) E. H. C. Oliphant defended his ascription of the play to Middleton against Eliot who has maintained the 'orthodox' view that it is from the pen of Tourneur. Oliphant also insisted on the priority in date, on stylistic grounds, of *The Atheist's Tragedy*.

Una Ellis-Fermor in *The Imagery of 'The Revenger's Tragedy'* and *'The Atheist's Tragedy'* (*M.L.R.*, July) has approached the

problem from a fresh angle, 'in the light thrown by a comparison of their imagery', and both the questions of authorship and date she decides against Oliphant. For the detailed consideration of the imagery and its treatment in the two tragedies readers must be referred to Miss Ellis-Fermor's article, in which she sums up thus:

'In view then of the great likeness in certain distinctive habits of mind that occur in both plays; the unusual precision of the drier imagery; the power of sustaining this precision through unusually long and articulated series; the delight in intellectual agility side by side with the gift of deep and penetrating poetic imagery; in view of a preponderance in both plays of images drawn from certain well-defined and yet unconnected fields of experience—business and finance, building, timber, and workmanship—I am convinced that the same man was the author of both and that if, in the case of *A.T.*, his name was Cyril Tourneur, that was undoubtedly also the name of the author of *R.T.*'

But because of certain differences which 'all point to a clearer habit of thought in *A.T.* than in *R.T.*', Miss Ellis-Fermor is convinced that the latter is the earlier, with an interval of some years.

Under the title of *The Greatest of Elizabethan Melodramas* Lacy Lockert discusses *The Revenger's Tragedy* in *The Parrott Presentation Volume*⁹ (pp. 103–26).

Another much debated problem is again raised by Elmer Edgar Stoll in *The Date of 'The Malcontent': A Rejoinder* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.). In opposition to Sir Edmund Chambers and H. R. Whalley, who assign *The Malcontent* to 1604, the year when it was first printed, Stoll adheres to the view that he first set forth in 1905 that the play was written in 1600, and here re-states the evidence as he sees it. The question is not merely one of the chronology of Marston's plays, but of the possible influence of *The Malcontent* on *Hamlet* or vice versa.

In an article on *The Anonymous Masque in MS. Egerton 1994* (*R.E.S.*, April) J. D. Jump recalls how Bullen pointed out that a long passage in the masque, on f. 215 r was apparently derived from Chapman's *Byron's Tragedy*, II. i. 20–51. Jump calls

⁹ See above, pp. 184–5.

attention to a large number of other minor similarities of imagery and phrasing between the masque and Chapman's plays and poems. But its general style is unlike his and Jump finds, perhaps too confidently, internal evidences of a date not earlier than 1641. As Chapman died in 1634 he concludes that the piece 'is either the revision by an unknown hand of a masque by Chapman, or a work substantially original, containing important borrowings from the earlier poet'. He prefers the former alternative.

Another play in MS. Egerton 1994 is discussed by Fred Benjamin Millett in *The Date and Literary Relations of 'Woodstock'*, part of a doctoral dissertation, privately circulated by the University of Chicago libraries. Millett gives a full account of the editorial and critical work devoted to this play from the purchase of the manuscript volume in 1865 by the British Museum till the issue of the Malone Society reprint (1929) under the title of *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock* (see *The Year's Work*, x. 201–2). He discusses in detail the question of its date and takes the side of those, including Miss Frijlinck, the Malone Society editor, who would assign it to the last decade of the sixteenth century as against those, of whom the present writer is one, who prefer a Jacobean date. The relation of *Woodstock* to the Chronicle-play type is considered, but to estimate adequately Millett's views and methods it would be necessary to see the complete dissertation in the Chicago University libraries.

A special aspect of the same play is discussed by John James Elson in *The Non-Shakespearian 'Richard II' and Shakespeare's 'Henry IV, Part I'* (*S. in Ph.*, April). Elsom directs his attention to the Chief Justice Tresilian, a 'voracious, conscienceless, pusillanimous figure'. He finds in his character, behaviour, and dramatic effect a striking resemblance to Sir John Falstaff, and from parallels in situation and wording infers that Shakespeare knew the anonymous play and was indebted for hints to it. This, of course, implies an acceptance of a sixteenth-century date for it.

In *The Plays of Edward Sharpham: Alterations Accomplished and Projected* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.) Clifford Leech gives illustrations

of 'the Elizabethan practice of hastily adapting a play to the particular needs of the moment'. In *Cupid's Whirligig* (1607) one of the characters is a poor and pretentious 'Welch Courtier' Nucome. But as he is asked to bestow 'one poore thistle' of his bounty, as he talks of 'siller', and as his mistress 'lookes like an Northerne Lasse', it seems as if Sharpham had intended Nucome to be Scotch, and had made him Welsh in fear of the censor.

The copy of *The Fleire* (1607) in the British Museum contains numerous cuts and changes in speech-headings and stage-directions. These result in a considerable reduction in the time of performance and in the number of actors required. The adapter seems to have had a private and provincial performance in view, though Leech doubts if the cut version was actually used.

In *Robert Davenport's Lustspiel, 'A New Trick to Cheat the Devil'* (*Anglia*, l ix. 3-4) Edward Eckhardt gives an account of a number of stories in verse and prose in different languages which are more or less parallel to the underplot in Davenport's comedy.

In *A Lost Elizabethan Play about Palamedes* (N. and Q., Aug. 31) M. H. Dodds quotes an epigram by William Percy in a manuscript collection (1616) referring to 'Ulysses in a Playe', where 'good comfits' were spread instead of 'barren salt'. The allusion is to Ulysses feigning madness to escape military service, ploughing the sand and sowing salt. Palamedes exposed the trick by placing Telemachus in front of the plough. No extant play on the subject is known. See also Edward Bensly's further note (Sept. 14).

M. Joan Sargeaunt in *John Ford*¹⁰ has contributed the most detailed critical study in 1935 of an Elizabethan dramatist. She begins with a sketch of Ford's early life and writings, 1586 to 1620, in which she embodies some of her work previously noticed (see *The Year's Work*, xiii. 184, and xv. 243-4) on Ford's connexion with the Middle Temple and his authorship of the poem *Christes Bloodie Sweat* and the pamphlet *The Golden*

¹⁰ *John Ford*, by M. Joan Sargeaunt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. pp. 232. 12s. 6d.

Meane. She then discusses the canon and chronology of Ford's plays from 1621, from which year till 1625 he seems to have collaborated with Dekker and others, and thereafter to have worked alone till probably 1638. Miss Sargeaunt discusses Ford's share in *The Witch of Edmonton*, *The Spanish Gipsy*, where she differs from Dugdale Sykes in not assigning to him the gipsy scenes, and *The Sun's Darling* which she takes to be probably a recasting of an older play or masque by Dekker. She agrees with F. L. Lucas in ascribing to Ford Act iv. i, of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*.

The first of two chapters on 'Ford as an independent dramatist' deals mainly with the relative importance of character and plot in his plays. Miss Sargeaunt finds in even the worst of his plays a deep insight into the human mind, 'but if the Aristotelian canon that plot is the most important element of drama is accepted without compromise, much of his work must be regarded as a failure. In only two of Ford's plays is the conduct of the plot entirely satisfactory: *The Broken Heart* and *Perkin Warbeck*.' The main plot of '*Tis Pity She's a Whore*' is handled with great skill, but the introduction of three underplots overloads the play. Generally it is in his treatment of material unrelated to his main plots, either melodrama or low comedy, that Miss Sargeaunt sees Ford's weakest side. On the other hand, 'in his presentation of individual characters given with a steadiness, consistency and lack of comment' he reaches a high pitch of dramatic art. Miss Sargeaunt illustrates this more particularly from his presentation of his women characters, many of whom have a strong family likeness, yet each has a marked individuality.

The discussion of Ford's sources includes an interesting consideration of his debt to Shakespeare, which Miss Sargeaunt thinks has been sometimes exaggerated. In the chapter on 'the setting of the plays' she lays stress on the point that Ford's choice of an Italian background for four of his plays and of a pseudo-Grecian for two others was deliberate and significant. But it is in the discussion of his dramatic verse that Miss Sargeaunt makes her highest claims for Ford. 'The extraordinary reserve and simplicity of his dialogue at its best are hardly to be found in any other dramatic writing of the age

outside some of the scenes of Shakespeare's plays.' Her scholarly and sympathetic study will certainly do a service to Ford's reputation which, as her final chapter shows, has gone through such varied phases.

The following American publications, which have not been available for fuller notice, have appeared in 1935:

The Real War of the Theatres: Shakespeare's Fellows in Rivalry with the Admiral's Men, 1594–1603. Repertories, Devices, and Types, by Robert Boies Sharpe. Boston: Heath.

A History of Elizabethan Revengeful Tragedy, by Fredson Thayer Bowers. (Harvard Univ. Ph.D. thesis, summary.)

Alexander Brome: His Life and Works, by John Lee Brooks. (Harvard Univ. Ph.D. thesis, summary.)

The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth. A Critical Edition by William Smith Wells. (Stanford Univ. Abstract of dissertation.)

Also the following continental publications:

Das Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland, by Anna Baesecke. (Halle: Niemeyer.)

Das englische Renaissancedrama im Spiegel zeitgenössischer Staatstheorien, by F. Grosse. (Breslau dissertation.)

IX

THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE

(1) *The Later Tudor Period*

By A. K. McILWRAITH

THE outstanding figures of the age form an impressive pageant in an agreeable little volume of broadcast talks on *Queen Elizabeth and her Subjects*, by A. L. Rowse and G. B. Harrison.¹ Besides the Queen herself, Burghley, Sidney, Essex, Marlowe, Raleigh, and Cardinal Allen, receive individual treatment, and there are supplementary chapters on 'Some Women of the Queen's Court', 'Three Elizabethan Actors', and in conclusion 'The Elizabethan Age' in general. Neither the space available nor the medium for which the essays were composed admit of anything in the nature of condensed biography, but by means of interpretation or of anecdote the authors present a series of vivid impressions of the leading personages of the time.

A much more detailed acquaintance with the Queen's character and the problems of her government can be gleaned from the hundred and eighty letters which G. B. Harrison has selected from 'between two and three thousand' and has printed as *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*.² The task of selection must have been more difficult for this volume than for others of the same series which present rulers of later times, for Harrison points out that there are four classes of correspondence which are all in some sense 'her letters': those written (1) by the Queen herself, (2) on her full instructions and subject to her supervision and correction, (3) with her signature and general approval, and (4) formally in her name, but actually by officials without reference to her. The distinction between state documents and the personal letters of the sovereign becomes more clearly marked as the power of the throne yields to the growth of Parliament and

¹ *Queen Elizabeth and her Subjects*, by A. L. Rowse and G. B. Harrison. Allen and Unwin. pp. 139. 5s.

² *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by G. B. Harrison. Cassell. pp. xvi + 324. 10s. 6d.

bureaucracy. The general principle of this selection is 'to show Queen Elizabeth as woman and ruler' by choosing the most significant personal letters and those official letters 'which showed her statecraft in the various crises and problems of her reign'.

The chosen letters, which are presented in a modernized text when the originals are in English and in a modern translation when they are in foreign languages, are disposed in five chapters, and are set in a running commentary comprising brief prefatory notes to each letter and more extensive introductions to each successive historical period. The subject-matter is personal and political, rarely if ever literary, and there is no facile solution to be found here of the enigmas of Elizabeth's character or policy, yet the selection is well calculated to awaken the interest of the general reader, and students will be grateful for expert guidance in a handy and compact form.

One of the problems which continually urged itself upon the attention of Elizabeth and her court was that of Ireland, and E. M. Hinton's *Ireland through Tudor Eyes*³ will prove a useful guide to the study of contemporary opinion. His period stretches roughly from 1568 to 1616, and his practice is to quote, summarize, and elucidate the views expressed by soldiers, administrators, geographers, and men of letters; Raleigh, Essex, Spenser, Bryskett, Campion, and many others appear in his pages, and the whole forms a lucid and readable chronological description of English writing on Ireland during the period.

From the rich stores accumulated in the Huntington Library, Louis B. Wright has drawn a substantial and fully documented study of *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*.⁴ Wright will not accept 'a conception of Elizabethan England as a land of dashing courtiers like Raleigh strewing coats in the mud for a queen to walk upon', based on the theatrical careers of the leading courtiers and statesmen; instead, he brings together a mass of evidence to show 'what the draper, the baker, the

³ *Ireland through Tudor Eyes*, by Edward M. Hinton. Pennsylvania and O.U. Presses. pp. xii+111. 9s.

⁴ *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, by Louis B. Wright. North Carolina Press and O.U.P. pp. xiv+733. 22s. 6d.

butcher, and their apprentices were reading and thinking'. His book is not the first witness to a renewed interest in the realities of Elizabethan life from day to day, but it is invaluable for its great wealth of illustrative quotations, many of them from books now excessively rare and unlikely ever to be reprinted in their entirety, and his systematic classification, ordering, and interpretation of his material combine with an excellent index to make it an easy book to consult.

The quotations will probably constitute the book's chief attraction to many readers who may lack the vigour to follow with unflagging energy the argument of its six hundred and fifty large pages of text, and they appear in part to have dictated its plan. It is for this reason, no doubt, that music and the fine arts are accorded only occasional reference in the portrayal of a popular culture wherein music in particular played a considerable part: our ancestors may have been almost as interested in singing as in cooking, but they wrote fewer books about it, so there is less for Wright to quote. Within the limits imposed by the available material, the picture is full and fascinating and remarkable in its diversity, and it fully bears out the author's contention that 'the great awakening of the Renaissance was not confined to the learned and the courtly elements in society', but was indeed particularly active in the citizen class from which the structure of our modern world is sprung.

The variety of the reading matter provided for the Elizabethan middle-class public is further illustrated by two, at least, of this year's Shakespeare Association Facsimiles. One of these is a two-coloured reproduction in the original red and black inks of *An Almanack and Prognostication for the Year 1598*.⁵ By this time the almanac had developed a conventional form—or rather three conventional forms—and the one here reproduced has been chosen as representative of a year of Shakespeare's prime and because it is sufficiently well preserved to permit of photographic reproduction. In an instructive and entertaining introduction E. F. Bosanquet explains the

⁵ *An Almanack and Prognostication for the Year 1598*, ed. by Eustace F. Bosanquet. Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles, no. 8. O.U.P. pp. xiv+ [47]. 6s.

development of the almanac in its three forms, and shows the distinction (which not all dramatists of the day seem to have observed in their allusions) between the 'almanac' and the 'prognostication', whereby the former stated astronomical fact and the latter meteorological and general and political speculations, based in part on common sense and in part on a scrupulous resolve to give the public the thrills it wanted.

Another volume in the series contains facsimiles of two prose pamphlets and a broadside ballad on the *Battle of Nieuport, 1600*,⁶ with an introductory essay by D. C. Collins on Elizabethan journalism. Collins, too, notes the sense of news value shown by the publishers of news pamphlets before the first beginnings of the periodical newspaper in this country, and finds that 'Taking the date of entry in the Stationers' Register as an approximate date of printing, it appears that any event of importance which was put forth in a news pamphlet was printed within ten days of the actual happening'.

A more sophisticated public comes before us in the paper on *Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker* contributed by W. W. Greg to *The Library* (Dec.). This contains much miscellaneous information about 'the control of book production and circulation, Parker's dealings with individual printers, and his own collecting and editing of ancient manuscripts', all of which necessarily contributes to our knowledge not only of the Archbishop's personal character and interests, but of literary concerns and the state of English studies in his day.

In matters of literary theory, a useful aid to clarity of thought and balance of judgement concerning the 'borrowings' of the Elizabethans is furnished by H. O. White's agreeable and lucid study of *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance*,⁷ which follows a single thread of argument with admirable steadfastness from its classical origins to the reign of James I. 'Eliza-

⁶ *Battle of Nieuport, 1600: Two News Pamphlets and a Ballad*, ed. by D. C. Collins. Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles, no. 9. O.U.P. pp. xxx+[18]+1 folding plate. 6s.

⁷ *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance: A Study in Critical Distinctions*, by Harold Ogden White. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xii+209. 10s. 6d.

bethan literary theorists, like their continental teachers, continually employ the word "imitation", without distinction, for following nature (*mimesis*) and for following other writers', and only in the latter sense is it White's subject; moreover he is primarily concerned with 'what English Renaissance writers say about imitation', and only in the second place and by way of illustration with what they *do* in practice. The book is thus in effect a survey of the answers given by English writers between 1500 and 1625 to the question: 'Should a writer imitate previous writers?'

The opening chapter gives in brief the consensus of opinion of classical antiquity, which condemned imitation when slavish or furtive or of the wrong things, but praised it when the imitator chose well and digested, transformed, and improved upon his models—when his imitation was, in White's favourite phrase, a reinterpretation. The fortune of this orthodox opinion is then traced through the writers of Renaissance Italy and France, who are shown in general to have adopted it, despite the less balanced insistence on pure copying, with no safeguard for originality, of Bembo, Vida, and Scaliger.

Before Sidney, White finds little valuable discussion of the question in England, since 'the great majority of the authors of the period either practised imitative composition without discussing their theories at all . . . or merely paid incidental homage to their models', but in the ninth decade of the century an examination of Sidney, King James, Webbe, *The Arte of English Poesie*, and Harington makes it possible to 'formulate the first approach to a canon of English Literary theory', one in substantial agreement with Classical and continental precedent.

The development of this canon is then traced through the critical and controversial writings of the next generation, adroit use being made of the objurgations which the combatants flung or abstained from flinging at one another in such quarrels as those of Nashe and Harvey, Marston, Dekker, and Jonson, and Marston and Hall (in which last he notes that the word 'plagiar' first appears). Churchyard stands out as the lonely and disgruntled opponent of imitation in any form, but with the growth in volume of English literature comes a 'steadily increasing demand for liberty, for originality' which leads to the full

and assimilated reproduction of classical theory at its best in the reign of James I, expressed in Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* and Jonson's *Discoveries*.

The single-mindedness with which White pursues his strictly limited theme through masses of confused, repetitive, and discursive writing gives his work a welcome clarity and unity, which is enhanced by contrast with his single lapse from relevance in an 'aside' on the authorship of Gascoigne's *Posies*. This might, perhaps, have given place to some analysis and illustration of the nature of that 'reinterpretation' which critical theory sought in a good imitator, for without some such contact with particulars the general theory remains somewhat remote in its unearthly clarity. No doubt the writers of the Renaissance are themselves responsible for creating this gap between theory and practice, but White has tactfully supplied their omissions elsewhere, and he would have earned added gratitude by doing so here.

The literary theories of the Elizabethans derive the greater part of their interest from the practice of the Elizabethan poets, and this is admirably illustrated in *England's Helicon*, which its latest editor H. E. Rollins⁸ calls 'the most beautiful of the Elizabethan poetical miscellanies and most distinguished from the point of view of authorship'. With it Rollins says he brings to an end 'the series of editions of the more important Elizabethan miscellanies that [he] began in 1924 with *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*', but it may be hoped that this farewell to miscellanies is to be read with emphasis on the qualifying phrases, at any rate whilst his pledge to edit *The Arbor of Amorous Devices* (noted in *The Year's Work*, xiv. 231) remains unredeemed.

The first volume of the present edition reprints page for page and without editorial interference the first edition of 1600, and the nineteen poems which were added in the second edition of 1614. The second volume, besides giving full textual and explanatory notes and discussions of the origins and authorship of each poem, contains an introduction dealing with the an-

⁸ *England's Helicon, 1600, 1614*, ed. by Hyder Edward Rollins. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. 2 vols., pp. xiv+228, viii+241. 12s. 6d. each volume.

thology as a whole and with its compiler. Rollins makes it clear that *England's Helicon*, like *Politeuphuia* (1598), *Wits Theatre* (1599), and *Belvedere* (1600), was dedicated to John Bodenham and not edited by him, and thinks it likely that whilst the unidentified 'A. B.' who signed the dedicatory sonnet was the titular editor the real work was done by the 'L. N.' who signed the address 'To the Reader, if indifferent', and whom he follows Bullen in identifying as Nicholas Ling. It seems paradoxical that the British Museum should have promptly catalogued Rollins's edition under the name of Bodenham.

Concerning Elizabethan poetry in general, Francis White Weitzmann has contributed some *Notes on the Elizabethan 'Elegie'* to *P.M.L.A.* (June), expressing his dissatisfaction with the lack of precision which he finds in the *O.E.D.*'s definition of the word and enumerating eight types of English poem to which it was applied, and the sonneteers have formed the subject of two useful notes in the *Rev. de Litt. Comp.* In the January–March number Janet G. Espiner (*née* Scott) acknowledges some of the supplements to her study of *Les Sonnets élisabéthains* made by Hugues Vaganay, and defines more clearly her opinion on certain points, and in the April–June number Vaganay himself, in a note on *Quatre Noms propres dans la littérature: Délie, Philothée, Ophélie, Pasithée*, touches in conclusion on English poetry in connexion with the Fourth Muse mentioned in one of the E. K.'s glosses to *The Shephearde's Calender* and in the anonymous sonnet sequence *Zepheria* of 1594.

A more extensive study of another of the older Elizabethan poets is that which Pierre Janelle has published of *Robert Southwell: the Writer*.⁹ According to Janelle 'it is no more possible to understand Southwell apart from Counter-Reformation Catholicism, than Bunyan apart from Puritan Protestantism', and he accordingly devotes the first half of his book to a sympathetic exposition of the doctrine and aims of the Roman church in general and of the Jesuits in particular, interweaving

⁹ *Robert Southwell: the Writer*, by Pierre Janelle. Sheed and Ward. pp. xiv+336. 16s.

with his account the history of Southwell's Jesuit education abroad and his experiences as a missionary in England up to the time of his death for his faith in 1595.

The remainder of the book is devoted to a careful analysis of Southwell's published or manuscript writings, prose and poetry alike. Many of these cannot be dated with any exactness on external evidence, but a few dates which are fixed enable Janelle to trace a steady development in Southwell's art from 'concettism to directness' and from the 'strongly Euphuistic' style of a prose fragment of 1586 or earlier to the 'clear, direct, and forcible controversial prose' of the *Humble Supplication* of 1591. In poetry too Southwell, while often translating foreign verse or imitating for pious ends the profane compositions of his fellow countrymen, shows signs of the same transition from artificial ingenuity to forthright directness.

It is true that modern critics do not generally place Southwell in the front rank of writers, and it is perhaps not quite Janelle's aim to urge them to do so; his peculiar interest as a Roman Catholic poet in Elizabethan England has been recognized before, but Janelle has augmented this interest by his literary analysis of the poet's technique and by the compassionate interest which he awakens in the sufferings and hardships of his life.

One aspect of Southwell's art is examined further in an article contributed by Ch. R. Mangam to the *Rev. Ang.-Amér.* (Aug.) on *Robert Southwell and the Council of Trent*. Mangam shows how the poet converted the erotic themes and pagan imagery of contemporary poetry to religious ones without sacrificing the fashionable attractions of alliteration, assonance, and antithesis; he calls attention to two direct retorts to profane poems, one of Thomas Watson and one (several times translated into English) of Petrarch, and suggests that the imperfect rhyming of Southwell's earlier verses is due to his familiarity with quantitative Latin verse, which made him overlook the effects of accent on the feminine rhymes which he attempted in English.

A winner of the Hawthornden Prize would perhaps be more at home in Chapter xiii, but Evelyn Waugh's life of *Edmund Campion*¹⁰ ought to be mentioned however briefly in con-

¹⁰ *Edmund Campion*, by Evelyn Waugh. Longmans. pp. x+225.
6s.

nexion with Janelle's study of Southwell. The two men may well have been acquainted at Douay, and they met the same fate in the same cause, after moving in the same circles in England.

It is an abrupt transition from these matters of faith and the spirit to record a note by Allan Griffith Chester (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) calling attention to *Thomas Churchyard's Pension of 20d.* a day for life, granted him by the queen in 1597.

Next to Spenser, Sir Philip Sidney continues to attract more attention than any non-dramatic Elizabethan poet. We find *Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella' Reconsidered* by Theodore Howard Banks in *P.M.L.A.* (June). Banks disputes the view that Sidney's sonnet sequence records an actual experience, and without denying the bare possibility that some Platonic affection is there reflected urges that Sidney was 'perhaps emulating his Italian friends, perhaps honoring his country by his poetical efforts, and almost certainly giving himself the pleasure of artistic self-expression'. The substance of J. M. Purcell's study of *Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella' and Greville's 'Cælica'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June) is a solid table of parallels between sonnets in the two sequences, in thought, imagery, and vocabulary. Resemblances between the work of Sidney and that of his friend and admirer are not surprising, as Purcell observes, but he finds 'that there are sufficient parallels to imply consultation, but not enough to sustain a charge of imitation or plagiarism against either writer'. Hoyt H. Hudson writes in the *Huntington Lib. Bull.* (Apr.) of *Penelope Devereux as Sidney's Stella*, bringing together many more or less open allusions of early date to the identification. He argues that Sidney's family were reluctant to hear his name coupled with that of his early love after the disgrace of her adultery and illegal second marriage, and suggests that the elegies of Spenser and Bryskett deliberately hinted at a false but innocuous identification of Stella with Frances Walsingham.

"

Sidney himself called his *Defence of Poesie* an 'inck-wasting toy' and his *Arcadia* 'a trifle, and that triflinglie handled', and the latter work has also been described in these pages as 'an idle tale to beguile a summer's day' (*The Year's Work*, viii).

187). From his study of *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman*¹¹ K. O. Myrick reaches the conclusions that the *Defence* is an oration, fashioned according to the principles of Quintilian, on behalf of the respondent Poetry in rebuttal of the plaintiff Gosson; and that the new *Arcadia* if not the old is an epic poem following the precepts of Minturno.

Of the three views, that the *Arcadia* is a trifle, a moral allegory, or a work of art, Myrick prefers the third, and he explains at length the attitude of an Elizabethan gentleman to literary composition, the '*sprezzatura*, the urbane nonchalance' commended by Castiglione, which inspired those slighting references to Sidney's own work which contrast so strongly with his general view of literature set forth in the *Defence*. Myrick addresses his book 'to the reader who has more than a passing acquaintance with the writings of Sir Philip Sidney', with the warning that 'The scholar . . . will find few items of information that he cannot easily find elsewhere'. What he has attempted is 'a new synthesis of facts which for the most part are already well known'. And if some of his conclusions as well as his facts strike the reader as familiar he should none the less be grateful for an orderly and lucid exposition of them.

E. Vine Hall has printed in *N. and Q.* (Jan. 12) extracts from the will of *Lettice, Countess of Leicester*, the tercentenary of whose death was the occasion of a memorial notice last year (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 221) in which the will was not quoted.

There has been no sign of abatement in the flood of work devoted to Spenser. A. C. Judson has pursued his biographical investigations in *A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bishop of Rochester*,¹² to whom Spenser became secretary in 1578 and in whose service, as many hold, he wrote most of the poems in *The Shepheards Calender*. 'A worthy, useful life he surely led, without, however, it would seem, any considerable element of

¹¹ *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman*, by Kenneth Orme Myrick. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. x+322. 15s.

¹² *A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, with Emphasis on his Relations with Edmund Spenser*, by Alexander Corbin Judson. (Indiana Univ. Studies, no. 103.) Bloomington: University Bookstore. pp. 41. 75 cents.

the noble or heroic', and his doctrinal views, like those of his secretary, are found to be equally distinct from Romanism and from Puritanism. It is perhaps the suggestion that Spenser did not share the distinguishing opinions of the Puritan movement that gives Judson's study its greatest interest, for there is no evidence that Young did much to mould the poet's philosophy.

Spenser's circle of friends is further examined in an article on *Lady Carey and Spenser* by Ernest A. Strathmann in *E.L.H.* (April). His survey of the documentary evidence concerning Lady Elizabeth Carey, second Baroness Hunsdon, and of the references to her in contemporary literature, leaves Strathmann sceptical of the theory that the dedication of *Amoretti* and the sonnet accompanying *The Faerie Queene* indicate a relation of courtly love between her and the poet, and he finds that 'Spenser's avowed addresses to Lady Carey are adequately explained by kinship, the conventional practices of literary patronage, and the generous hospitality which won others to praise the Careys'.

The fourth volume of the Variorum Spenser has made its punctual and welcome appearance, containing *The Faerie Queene, Book Four*, edited by Ray Heffner.¹³ In this volume the progressive shrinkage of exegetical matter, already noticeable last year (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 210–11) has continued, in part because many general topics have already been dealt with in appendixes or notes in the earlier volumes, and in part perhaps because the second three books have on the whole aroused less critical comment in the past than have the first three. The principles of the edition are unaltered, and publisher, printer, and editor fully maintain their high standards.

Heffner has also printed in *M.L.N.* (March) a note on *The Printing of John Hughes's Edition of Spenser, 1715*, which forms a supplement to the first two volumes of the Variorum and explains some apparent errors in the collations there printed; and Jewel Wurtsbaugh (*ibid.*) has elucidated the relations of *Thomas*

¹³ *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, ed. by Edwin Greenlaw, Charles Grosvenor Osgood, Frederick Morgan Padelford. *The Faerie Queene, Book Four*, ed. by Ray Heffner. Johns Hopkins Press and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 357. 27s. each volume, not sold separately.

Edwards and the Editorship of the 'Faerie Queene' in 1750 and 1751 from the correspondence of Edwards which is preserved in the Bodleian Library.

A general survey of *Platonic Ideas in Spenser* has been undertaken by Mohinimohan Bhattacherje,¹⁴ who traces their development from the early poems and the earlier books of *The Faerie Queene* to the later books. He shows how the ostensibly Aristotelian framework of Spenser's thought is throughout illuminated by gleams of Platonic profundity, derived at first from Plato himself and later from the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus as expounded by his Italian and French followers of the Renaissance. An exposition on these lines necessarily covers some familiar ground, and Bhattacherje has been able to profit by all but the most recent research. It should be observed that his volume, although dated 1935, actually appeared in the previous year, too soon for him to cite the new-found translation of the *Axiochus* as evidence of Spenser's direct knowledge of the Platonic canon.

The second book of *The Faerie Queene* is that in which Spenser is generally held to have kept closest to his professed model of the twelve moral virtues of Aristotle, and special interest therefore attaches to Bhattacherje's quest for Platonism there. His equation of Pyrochles, Cymochles, and Guyon to the three Platonic elements of the Soul, Passion, Appetite, and Reason, may seem to be rather strained, and to neglect the special compound Mean which Aristotle devised for his virtue of Courage, but there is force in Bhattacherje's argument that the internal sufferings of Pyrochles belong rather to Plato's conception of passions at discord within the Soul than to any Aristotelian extreme. In Book I, also, his readiness to surrender the Redcrosse Knight to Calvin as a Christian conception lends weight to his claim for Una as an embodiment of Platonic Truth.

Several other writers have made general surveys of Spenser's poetry from particular points of view. Rosemond Tuve has contributed to *J.E.G.P.* (Jan.) a sympathetic study of *Spenser and the 'Zodiakte of Life'*, the translation of Palingenius by Bar-

¹⁴ *Platonic Ideas in Spenser*, by Mohinimohan Bhattacherje. Calcutta: Longmans, Green. pp. xii + 200. Rs. 2.8.

nabe Googe which was commended by Harvey. She sees in it not a mechanical source for Spenser's words or images, but an influence on his thought and ideas, and an element in the growth of his astronomical philosophy. E. C. Knowlton, writing of *Spenser and Nature* in *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.), has shown that the poet was following classical and Renaissance precedent in treating Nature as the divine power of Order in the world.

In his study of *Spenser's Irish River Stories* Roland M. Smith (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) claims for Spenser at once a greater familiarity with Irish legend and a less irresponsible imagination than the accepted view imputes to him. The 'stories' in question are those in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (92–155) and in the *Cantos of Mutabilitie* (vi. 38–55).

Jewel Wurtsbaugh writes appreciatively in *R.E.S.* (April) of *Digby's Criticism of Spenser*, and quotes some of his more penetrating and remarkable comments.

There has been further discussion of the nature of Gloriana's Feast and the part it was to play in *The Faerie Queene*. Ivan L. Schulze (*M.L.N.*, March) discusses *Elizabethan Chivalry and the Faerie Queene's Annual Feast*, and urges that since Elizabeth's reign saw the continuance, revival, or institution of many such chivalric festivals this should be regarded not as a bit of mechanical framework, but as a significant element in the chivalric purpose of the poem; and in a comparative study of *The Elizabethan Entertainment and 'The Faerie Queene'* Howard W. Hintz (*P.Q.*, Jan.) argues that Spenser's poem reveals striking resemblances in its plan and in its outstanding episodes to the entertainments prepared for Queen Elizabeth's royal progresses, of which he takes as typical that at Kenilworth in 1575 as described by Robert Laneham.

The *Observations on the Epic Similes in 'The Faerie Queene'* which Zaidee E. Green has contributed to *P.Q.* (July) are concerned with the purpose of the similes, not with their sources; it is interesting that they should occur more frequently in the second half of the poem than in the first, since a change in their function is also suggested.

Several particular points in *The Faerie Queene* have been the subjects of critical investigation. H. Edward Cain (*Shakespeare*

Assoc. Bull., July) would associate Spenser's 'Shield of Faith' borne by the Redcrosse Knight with the legend SCVTVM FIDEI PROTEGET EVM engraved on the half-sovereigns of Edward VI, a legend revived by Queen Elizabeth at the beginning of her reign; and in a note on *Una and Duessa* Roland M. Smith (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) argues that both names and not only the former are of Irish origin. *Duessa* is recorded as a Middle-Irish woman's name in some such form as *Dubhéasa*, and Spenser might have been struck by the apt connotations of the noun *dóibhéas* = 'vice, bad manners'.

Spenser's Palmer is the title given by Merritt Y. Hughes to a paper on the externalizing of Conscience in Elizabethan poetry and drama which has appeared in *E.L.H.* (Sept.). Since each person in *The Faerie Queene* plays a dual part, as an actor in the story and as the 'externalized' symbol of a mental quality, Hughes's treatment of the Palmer (in his second function) as a projection of part of the mind of Guyon (in his first) is less convincing than that of the Old Man who dissuades Faustus from suicide in Marlowe's tragedy, but the suggestion that Spenser in his narrative distinctly conceived of the Palmer as an embodied rational spirit is interesting. Charles W. Lemmi (*M.L.N.*, March) adds a few to the instances he has already indicated of *Symbolism in 'Faerie Queene'*, II. 12.

The theory of friendship expounded in the fourth book of *The Faerie Queene* has been examined in two studies by Charles G. Smith. Writing in *S. in Ph.* (April) on *Spenser's Theory of Friendship: an Elizabethan Commonplace* he seeks to show that Spenser is here portraying the opposite effects of the forces of concord and of discord, and that this concept is common in Elizabethan poetry and pageantry. In a further article on *Sententious Theory in Spenser's Legend of Friendship* contributed to *E.L.H.* (Sept.) he takes as a starting-point his previous conclusion (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 217) that Spenser saw friendship as 'the operation in the world of man of a harmonizing and unifying principle of cosmic love', and sets out to prove that Spenser's view rests upon seven propositions, and that these propositions were commonly accepted at the time. He is more successful in showing that his seven propositions were in fact

widely accepted, and were derived not only from Greek philosophy but from a revival of proverbial wisdom in Renaissance England, than in establishing the necessity of their connexion with the Theory of Friendship.

Kerby Neill (*E.L.H.*, Sept.) opens his account of *The 'Faerie Queene' and the Mary Stuart Controversy* with a substantial and lucid account of the various phases of this controversy, with a view to seeing how far this analysis will support the different identifications which have been made of Mary with the various women in Spenser's poem. Of these he considers only three to be worth considering, those with Duessa, Acrasia, and Radigund. In conclusion he shows that Books IV and V are a 'continued allegory' with Duessa representing Mary Stuart throughout, and promises to return in later articles to treat of Acrasia and of Radigund.

Two Notes on the Philosophy of 'Mutabilitie' printed by Brents Stirling in *M.L.N.* (March) supplement his earlier papers (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 217, xiv. 227) by showing that these final cantos are indebted to Golding's version of Ovid, and that their philosophy must on any interpretation remain Boethian. J. M. Purcell in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) uses the evidence of the relative frequency at different stages of the poet's development of words denoting colour and light and shade to determine *The Date of Spenser's 'Mutabilitie' Cantos*, and finds that these show a greater affinity with the first part of *The Faerie Queene* than with the second. Since similar analyses by other scholars have pointed the opposite way, he concludes that 'the counting of words in a partial analysis of vocabulary is not satisfactory evidence' of the chronological order of the composition of a poet's works.

In *P.M.L.A.* (March) Agnes Duncan Kuersteiner argues against Herford and the generality of Spenserians that *E.K. is Spenser*, making a good point that the glosses are not so inaccurate as has been claimed, but dealing less cogently with the argument that E. K.'s praise of Spenser makes their identity improbable. His study of *The Composition of the 'Shephearde's Calender'* leads Roland Bassett Botting (*P.M.L.A.*, June), who does not accept the identification of E. K. and Spenser, to

observe many inconsistencies between different poems in the collection, although no one poem is internally inconsistent. From this he infers that the volume was composed in part at least of earlier work hastily brought together. Leicester Bradner describes *The Latin Translations of Spenser's 'Shepheardes Calender'* in *Mod. Phil.* (Aug.). Of these there were two, one made by John Dove about 1584 and never published, the other made by Theodore Bathurst 'not long after 1608', and first published in 1653, two years after the translator's death.

Henry G. Lotspeich (*E.L.H.*, Nov.) writes of Spenser's '*Virgils Gnat*' and its *Latin Originals*, showing grounds for preferring the edition published at Antwerp in 1542 by A. Dumaeus to the Plantin text used by Renwick.

The title of Spenser's '*Foure Hymnes*: *Addenda*' is given by Josephine Waters Bennett to a substantial article in *S. in Ph.* (April) in which she supports against the criticism of F. M. Padelford her original contention that the *Foure Hymnes* are the considered expression of a single coherent course of thought. She argues that this is derived from the Christian Neo-Platonists of the Renaissance, and questions the existence of a real opposition such as Padelford implies between Christian doctrine and ancient Neo-Platonism.

H. G. Lotspeich (*M.L.N.*, March) challenges the view that Spenser's *Urania* in *The Teares of the Muses* shows the poet momentarily forgetful of her precise function, and shows that the concern with theology and philosophy there ascribed to her was already associated with her by Spenser's admired model Du Bartas.

Astery's Transformation in 'Muiopotmos' is traced by Charles W. Lemmi (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) to a source in Lactantius's commentary on the *Thebais* of Statius.

In *M.L.N.* (March) Kathrine Koller prints some *Identifications* in '*Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*' made in a hand of the early seventeenth century in the margins of a copy belonging to Mr. Gabriel Wells. They appear to be without authority, but agree in the main with modern findings; and the anonymous commentator also quotes a couplet from the 1605 edition of Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas with the note that 'This was made by Josuah Silvester of Edmund Spenser'. That Spen-

ser's Action in the same poem may be Marlowe, an identification previously suggested by W. L. Renwick, is made independently by Arthur Gray (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 24) and warmly supported by Renwick himself (*ibid.*, Jan. 31). It is, however, disputed by Kathleen Tillotson (*ibid.*, Feb. 7), who prefers Drayton.

The question of *Spenser or Anthony Munday?*—*A Note on the 'Axiochus'* is debated by Bernard Freyd and Frederick M. Padelford in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.). Freyd shows the weakness of the external evidence for Spenser's authorship of the translation, and argues on external and internal grounds for Munday. Padelford replies with a fuller statement of the case for Spenser than was made in his edition of the work last year (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 212).

'*Newes out of Munster*', *A Document in Spenser's Hand*, printed by Raymond Jenkins in *S. in Ph.* (April), is a brief report written in March 1581–2, which he believes to be in the poet's handwriting.

Turning to poets who may conveniently be classed as 'later' than Spenser, we find the '*Fortunio*' and '*Raymundus*' of Joseph Hall's *Virgidemiae*, Book IV (1598) conjecturally identified by Sidney H. Atkins (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 3) with Captain Laurence Keymis or Kemys, who sailed to Guiana for gold in 1596, and Sir Walter Ralegh, whilst A. Davenport (*R.E.S.*, Jan.) writes on *John Weever's 'Epigrammes' and the Hall-Marston Quarrel*, pointing out Weever's direct allusions to Hall's *Virgidemiae*, identifying Hall as Weever's Crassus, and suggesting that he is attacked elsewhere under the pseudonym of Corvus.

The 'T.A.' who wrote *The Massacre of Money* (1602) has been identified with Thomas Achelly, but F. B. Williams, Jnr. (*T.L.S.*, Feb. 21) advances reasons for considering Thomas Andrewe more likely, since the former is last heard of in 1582 and the latter was still writing in 1604.

In a further study of *Leicester's Ghost*, which he had already identified as the work of Thomas Rogers of Bryanstone and had shown to date from about 1604 (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 219), Franklin B. Williams, Jnr. (*Harvard Studies in Philology and Literature*, vol. xviii) discusses the questions of its source, models, and date, and describes the contents of the poem both in its

longer manuscript form and in the shorter published version (which he believes to have been prepared by the author himself).

Hugues Vaganay contributes to *Rev. de Litt. Comp.* (Jan.–March) a note on *L'Œuvre d'un évêque français traduite par Josuah Sylvester*, in which he calls attention to the French originals of several of the translations to be found in the 1633 edition of Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas, in particular among the poems of Pierre or Philibert du Val, bishop of Séez in 1545, which appeared in English under the title of *Little Bartas*.

On the borderline of this section and the next, part of the field of English Emblem Literature which was covered last year by Mario Praz (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 230) is minutely examined in the Basle dissertation of Irma Tramer,¹⁵ who discusses in detail the work and sources in this vein of Andrew Willet and George Wither, and reproduces some interesting pages in facsimile. A. Joly has published a comprehensive study of the work of *William Drummond de Hawthornden*¹⁶ which arrived too late for full consideration. It appears to be critical and judicious as far as it goes, but to be hampered by its failure to take account of any work published since 1928, so that the work on the sonnet cycles of Janet G. Scott and of Lu Emily Pearson (with the latter of whom the author is often in unconscious agreement) was not available.

It is perhaps natural that in the Elizabethan period prose writers should receive less attention than poets, but their share has not been small. Light is thrown by C. R. Baskerville (*T.L.S.*, Aug. 15) on the career of *Richard Mulcaster* before 1561, when he became headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School, and the entire or partial authorship is ascribed to him of a pageant written to celebrate Elizabeth's coronation. *John Frampton's Account of the Tobacco-Plant*, the first to appear in English,

¹⁵ *Studien zu den Anfängen der puritanischen Emblemliteratur in England*, by Irma Tramer. Berlin, pp. iv + 91.

¹⁶ *William Drummond de Hawthornden, 1585–1649: Aperçu d'ensemble sur la vie et l'Œuvre du Poète*, by A. Joly. Lille: à l'Economat des Facultés Catholiques. pp. xii + 165.

occurs in his *Joyfull newes out of the newe founde worlde* of 1577. Since the description of the tobacco plant is not found in the Spanish work by Nicolas Monardes of which Frampton's book is a translation, it has been regarded as original, but Ralph E. Ockenden (*N. and Q.*, Feb. 2) shows that it is translated from *L'Agriculture et Maison Rustique* of Charles Estienne and Jean Liébault, of which a second edition appeared in 1570. In a brief but useful note in *T.L.S.* (Apr. 25) on *The Hauen of Hope* (1585) F. B. Williams, Jnr., points out that this work which is ascribed in the *S.T.C.* and elsewhere to 'R.A.' has a dedication signed by Raphe Allin.

Hyder E. Rollins (*Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, vol. xviii) gives in his *Notes on the Sources of Melbancke's Philotimus* a long series of parallel quotations from the novel of 1583 and the many and varied works from which Melbancke appropriated his material. The evidence which Rollins presents shows that he does not exaggerate when he says that *Philotimus* 'is literally a cento, whole paragraphs, at times whole pages, being lifted from other Elizabethan writers without the change of a significant word'.

Harold Jenkins's paper *On the Authenticity of 'Greene's Groatsworth of Wit' and 'The Repentance of Robert Greene'* in *R.E.S.* (Jan.) is a reasoned and cogent defence of these two pamphlets, whose authorship and veracity were impugned by C. E. Sanders (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 235-6). Jenkins points out that Greene need not have written them in 'the last few days before his death', since his fatal illness lasted for 'about a moneths space', and accepts the *Groatsworth* as written when the author's condition was dangerous but not desperate and the *Repentance* as a later work when all hope had left him, with obvious posthumous editorial additions.

Don Cameron Allen writes in *S. in Ph.* (April) of '*The Anatomie of Absurditie': A Study in Literary Apprenticeship*', tracing many of Nashe's classical instances to the *Officina* of Ravisius Textor (1522).

Several words in *Gabriel Harvey's Vocabulary* which are not adequately defined in the *O.E.D.* are listed and discussed by J. M. Purcell in *T.L.S.*, May 23, and some further *Printed Books*

with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph or MS. Notes are recorded by G. C. Moore Smith in *M.L.R.* (April).

In a note on *Chapman and Florio* in *T.L.S.* (June 20) H. L. R. Edwards argues that it is Florio rather than Shakespeare or any other whom Chapman is attacking in a passage in *The Shadow of te Night*.

An analysis of *Thomas Deloney's Euphuistic Learning and 'The Forest'* by Hyder E. Rollins (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) shows that many of the novelist's examples of pseudo-natural history whose ultimate source was classical were more immediately derived from *The Forest* of Thomas Fortescue, published in 1576.

The recent labours of N. B. Paradise, C. J. Sisson, and Alice Walker have made it possible for Edward Andrews Tenney to keep his biography of *Thomas Lodge*¹⁷ free from unwieldy masses of documentation, and to compose a smooth and readable narrative. His account, in the first two chapters, of Lodge's complex family might have been easier to digest if it had been illustrated by a tabular pedigree, and it leaves the impression of being fuller than is really necessary for the understanding of Lodge's family pride and family quarrels, but thenceforth the account moves steadily forward. The writings of A. Clark, W. P. Baildon, H. E. D. Blakiston, and others assist Tenney to paint pictures of the life of an undergraduate at Oxford and of a student in Lincoln's Inn into which the known facts of Lodge's early career are neatly fitted, and to the Lincoln's Inn period belongs the quarrel with Stephen Gosson over the morality of stage plays which first brought Lodge before the general public as a man of letters.

For his literary career, from the publication of *An Alarum against Usurers* in 1584 to that of *Prosopopeia* in 1596, the chief evidence is of two sorts, more or less explicit literary references in his own and other men's works, and legal documents generally concerning his disputes with his numerous creditors or with his elder brother William, though the episode of the 'disastrous voyage towards the South Sea with Sir Thomas Cavendish' in the years 1591 to 1593 has a special set of sources to itself. The

¹⁷ *Thomas Lodge*, by Edward Andrews Tenney. Cornell Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 202. 9s.

novels, pamphlets, plays, and poems are described, quoted, and appraised in their proper places, but literary criticism and 'research' are subordinated to biography in the structure of the work. Tenney suspects Lodge of being drawn to the Roman Catholic church at a very early stage in his career, and indeed suggests that this was why he did not take his M.A. in 1581 and why the Privy Council required his appearance before it in June of that year. This is attractive, as is the identification (which Paradise rejects) of Lodge as 'The Prodigall Young Master' described in Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse*; but it is in his treatment of Lodge's later years, from 1597 to 1625, that Tenney differs most sharply from most recent biographers. Lodge's year of study for a medical degree at Avignon, which required a public profession of the Roman faith, is sketched against as full and sympathetic a background as are his student days in Oxford and London, and high praise is given to his professional devotion during the plague of 1603 and to the disinterested zeal in the service of humanity which led him to make public the lessons of his medical learning and experience, though the bibliographical argument whereby Tenney seeks to show that his *Treatise of the Plague* (1604) was issued for free distribution is not valid. Even his intestacy at his death of the plague in 1625, which has been taken as a sign of his characteristic improvidence, is here attributed to an unselfish devotion to duty which left him no time to spare for his personal affairs.

In *T.L.S.* (Feb. 7) Sidney H. Atkins summarizes his previous arguments to show that some parts of Lodge's *A Fig for Momus* (1595) were written some years previously, and adduces further evidence, and a page and a half in the *Radcliffe College Summaries of Theses, 1931-1934* is devoted to a thesis on *Sources of the Natural History in the Literary Works of Thomas Lodge* by Deborah Champion Jones.

In the restlessly active and widely varied life of *Sir Walter Ralegh*¹⁸ writing and literary relations play a comparatively small part, and in the new biography by Edward Thompson only a few chapters out of many deal directly with things of the

¹⁸ *Sir Walter Ralegh*, by Edward Thompson. Macmillan. pp. xvi + 387. 15s.

mind, the remainder being devoted to an account and an examination of Raleigh as a man of action and of business, at sea and in Ireland, Virginia, Cornwall, and London. In these the deeds and character of 'The Last of the Elizabethans' are vividly portrayed, with increasing sympathy and sureness of touch as the work progresses. The protesting apoloiae for Elizabethan treachery and cruelty in politics and in war of the opening chapters give place in the closing scenes to unstinted praise of Raleigh and unrelieved scorn and contempt for Sir Lewis Stukeley (who probably deserves it) and for Coke and King James, whose actions offer some openings to a favourable advocate.

The chapter on Raleigh the 'Poet; and Friend of Poets' brings out the basis of spiritual zest for knowledge which underlay Raleigh's friendship with Spenser, Marlowe, the astronomer Harriot, and others, and is concerned with Raleigh's poems less as works of art than as clues to his nature. The *Booke of the Ocean to Scynthia*, though referred to, is not discussed, and his anxiety to find in Raleigh some glimmer of wit, if not of humour, betrays Thompson into a misreading of the *Faerie Queene* sonnet 'Me thought I saw the graue, where *Laura* lay', in which the 'celestiall theife' is surely not Spenser but the Faerie Queene herself. In a later chapter on 'Sherborne; and *The History of the World*' Thompson finds more to his purpose in the revelation of Raleigh's character, and he also gives just praise to the personal and living quality of the prose in which the *History* is written, eagerly adopting Firth's indication of the influence exerted by Raleigh's thought and style over Milton.

This book and Sargent's work on Sir Edward Dyer (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 209–10) were the occasion of a leading article in *T.L.S.* (May 9) on *The Tudor Character*, which led to a further discussion between Thompson and the reviewer in the correspondence columns (May 16, 23, and 30), and the same journal had previously devoted another leading article (Jan. 31) to *Sir Walter Raleigh's Prose*.

Norman A. Brittin (*T.L.S.*, Feb. 21) shows that the date 1577 appended to the dedication of the English translation of Innocent Gentillet's *Discours contre Machiavel* by Simon Patericke,

published in 1602, was simply taken over from a Latin version of that date, and therefore furnishes only a *terminus a quo* for dating Patericke's work. His further implication that Patericke was also the signatory of the dedication in this Latin version is rebutted by Kathleen T. Butler (*ibid.*, March 28), who gives further details of the French, Latin, and English versions.

The tenth Shakespeare Association Facsimile is a replica not only of *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey*¹⁹ but also of *Ratseis Ghost*. Each of these anonymous prose pamphlets (both probably published in 1605) has survived in a single copy, the first in Oxford and the second in Manchester. The latter was reproduced in 1933 by the Rylands Library (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 238), but it is convenient to have both together in a single handy volume. In a brief prefatory note S. H. Atkins culls a few contemporary allusions to Ratsey's repute as a highwayman.

George Morrow Kahrl (*Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, vol. xviii) finds in Robert Tofte's *Annotations in 'The Blazon of Jealousie'* evidence of a wide familiarity with Italian literature and of that hatred of women which generally dictated Tofte's choice of works to be translated. He also points out that many of Tofte's translations of illustrative quotations from the Latin poets are original, particularly those from Propertius and from some works of Ovid, and that they are in some cases the earliest known English versions.

A Manuscript Work by Sir George Buc is described by R. C. Bald in *M.L.R.* (Jan.). This is an autograph manuscript of over 800 pages, written originally in 1614, with additions and alterations till 1621, entitled *A Commentary upon the Newe Roule of Winchester . . . Especially concerning the Baronage, & ancient Nobility of England*. It refers several times to Buc's earlier work *The Baron*, and contains some notes for his later *History of Richard III*. Bald gives a full description of the work, and quotes from it many interesting comments on contemporary men and events.

¹⁹ *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey*, ed. by S. H. Atkins. Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles, no. 10. O.U.P. pp. xii+[93]. 6s.

An entertaining biographical sketch of Lady Anne, *The Mother of Francis Bacon*, by M. St. Clare Byrne, appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* (Dec. 1934) and should have been mentioned last year.

(2) *The Earlier Stuart Age and the Commonwealth*

By L. C. MARTIN

As in previous years a substantial part of this section will be concerned with studies of Milton, who is sometimes also of central importance in the discussions of wider topics to be noticed first.

The nature and effects of Puritanism continue to receive attention. Theodor Spira, for instance, contributes to *Anglia* (Oct.) some valuable reflections *Zum Wesen des Puritanismus*, having reference to recent studies of seventeenth-century literature, by Willey, Kraus, Schöffler, Hans-Oskar Wilde, and others. Spira touches upon such matters as the relations of Puritanism with scholastic thought, the origins of the conflict between belief and rationality, and the concern of the reforming spirit with a unifying conception of life; and he both deprecates and avoids any undue simplification of the manifold questions at issue.

In connexion with Haller's selected *Tracts on Liberty*, noticed below (pp. 251-2), A. S. P. Woodhouse provides in the *University of Toronto Quarterly* (April) an article-review on *Puritanism and Liberty*, in which the distinction is made between those who, like Milton, regarded liberty as the peculiar prerogative of the regenerate, and others, like Roger Williams, who passed on to a completely democratic position, adding equality to liberty in the political sphere. In the same journal (July) and by the same writer, the argument is further elaborated in an article on *Milton, Puritanism, and Liberty*; and it is shown how Reformation and Renaissance met in Milton to give him not only his individualistic conception of liberty but also his aristocratic leanings.

'One of the momentous effects of the Renaissance . . . was to give new life to the idea of the decay of the world by planting

mutability in the heavens and by stimulating admiration for Antiquity.' This is the theme developed by George Williamson in a lengthy treatment of *Mutability, Decay, and Seventeenth-Century Melancholy* contributed to *E.L.H.* (Sept.). The heavens were no longer to be considered incorruptible and, in spite of the argument that change in the parts does not necessarily imply degeneration in the whole, there was general addiction to the theory that the world was senescent and that 'twas too late to be ambitious. Williamson sees in this concept the chief source of seventeenth-century melancholy as well as 'the sounding-board for the finest eloquence of the time'.

In an article *Zum Problem des Barocks in der englischen Dichtung* (*Anglia*, Oct.) Friedrich Wild refers to the variety of contexts in which the term 'baroque' has been thought appropriate and shows how in English poets (Chapman, Ben Jonson, Massinger, and others) the 'baroque' elements are to be found side by side with tendencies of a quite different origin and character. He sees the necessity for what has yet to be furnished, 'eine einheitliche Definition des Barocks . . . und einen Einblick in die letzten Wesensgründe der Barockkultur'.

Those who would be acquainted with what England and Scandinavia knew and thought of each other in the seventeenth century will find sure guidance and abundant cause for satisfaction in Ethel Seaton's contribution¹ to the literature of this subject. This is an important work, not least because it reveals, with fullness and precision, the circumstances antecedent to the more thorough awakening of learned and imaginative interest in Scandinavia which marks the following century in England. It is difficult to suppose that many significant facts or even details have escaped Miss Seaton's notice; yet the details do not blur the outlines. The main course of the development stands forth clearly, a development from the ignorance and contempt characteristic of Elizabethan references, to the intimacy and respect gradually won through trade and travel, political and social

¹ *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century*, by Ethel Seaton (Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature). O.U.P. pp. xvi+384. 15s.

intercourse, and scholarly investigation. Miss Seaton admits in her final chapter, on 'The Scandinavian Impress upon English Literature', that the impress was not deep, 'but it can be traced in many more literary, or would-be literary, works than at present seems to be realized'; and this is well illustrated. But perhaps the main value of her survey lies in its delineations of the seventeenth-century mind, in one connexion but in many moods and forms of expression.

The Christian Muse considered by Lily B. Campbell in the *Huntington Library Bulletin* (Oct.) is the 'Urania' made conspicuous by Milton's invocation of her, but not then for the first time distinguished as the Muse of divine poetry rather than of astronomy. Milton, it is shown, was following a tradition apparently instituted by Du Bartas in his *La Muse chrétienne* (1574), and the works of Sidney, Harvey, Spenser, and others are cited to illustrate the extent to which the Christianized conception of Urania found favour in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In two articles by Marjorie Nicolson, *The Telescope and Imagination* (*Mod. Phil.*, Feb.) and *The New Astronomy and English Literary Imagination* (*S. in Ph.*, July), stress is laid upon the stimulative effect of the discoveries made by Kepler and Galileo, which, because of their closer connexion with sense perception, are represented as more important in this regard than the more intellectual Copernican theory. An account is given of the development of astronomical science in seventeenth-century England through the use of the telescope, and it is shown how powerfully the imaginations of Ben Jonson, Donne, and others were influenced both by the telescope and by what it revealed. The same writer discusses *Milton and the Telescope* in *E.L.H.* (April), marking the contrast between his early works, which offer relatively little evidence that he was specially interested or versed in astronomical lore, and *Paradise Lost*, where such evidence is pervasive. Miss Nicolson thinks that Milton not merely was influenced by what he may have heard or read of Galileo's discoveries but had at some time 'actual personal experience with the telescope'; and she connects with this

experience the numerous effects of distance and of spatial vastness which *Paradise Lost* presents.

A full exposition, by way of passages drawn from many authors, of Anglican thought in the seventeenth century could not fail to be of interest to students of English prose and its intellectual conditioning during that epoch; and the compilation² by Paul Elmer More and Frank Leslie Cross which has this end in view has been made on a scale and with a care that should give it enduring as well as definitive value. The extracts are ranged under nineteen heads, such as The Anglican Faith, The Bible, Prayer, The Sacraments, Ethics, Caroline Piety, and each section has its subdivisions. Exponents of the Anglican faith and attitude will find here a notably useful store of texts, all the more because some of the citations are from works which apparently have not been reprinted. There is an introductory essay by More on 'The Spirit of Anglicanism' and an historical account of 'Anglicanism in the Seventeenth Century' by Felix R. Arnott.

Another very welcome assemblage is that of nineteen tracts, reproduced in facsimile, 'upon the central theme of all revolutionary discussion from 1637 to 1647, the doctrine of liberty'. These appeared in 1934 in two volumes prepared by William Haller,³ who introduces them and adds notes, bibliography, and appendixes in a separate volume. The work, which was not noticed last year, is extremely useful, not only because it makes the texts more generally available but because it enables its readers to follow, with Haller's guidance, the course of the debate. Milton's *Areopagitica* and Williams's *The Bloudy Tenent* are excluded as already easily accessible, but they are frequently mentioned and brought into relation with the general development. Students of Milton will be particularly grateful for the

² *Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Paul Elmer More and Frank Leslie Cross. S.P.C.K. pp. lxxvi+811. 21s.

³ *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution 1638-1647*, ed. by William Haller. Columbia and O.U. Presses. Vol. i, Commentary, pp. xv+197. Vol. ii, Facsimiles, Part i, pp. 339. Vol. iii, Facsimiles, Part ii, pp. 405. 63s.

Appendix in which his repute during the years immediately following 1643 is examined and the points made, in opposition to Masson, that Milton was then little known to the pamphleteers and the public at large save as the exponent of scandalous views on divorce, that he was not closely associated with any recognized sectarian groups, and that *Areopagitica* attracted little attention. One of the outstanding figures represented here is William Walwyn, whose pamphlets are important not only for their doctrine and spirit but for their illustrations of the stylistic movement, traced by the editor, away from formality and decoration towards the more popular idiom later favoured by Bunyan and Defoe.

H. Belloc's study of Milton's personality and writings,⁴ or of 'the Miltonic Episode in English Letters', recalls Johnson's *Life* in its generosity of praise and its trenchancy of adverse criticism. He also shares, though with a Catholic difference, Johnson's distaste for the poet's religious, political, and social heterodoxies, and finds very little to commend even in the style of the prose works; but he is full of admiration for Milton the poet, when the creative spirit was most alive in him. Belloc has not found it necessary to quote his authorities, and some of the most interesting parts of his work are those which record his own aesthetic judgements. These must command respect, and some of them are of considerable value for their freshness and nicety of perception. If others are less convincing it is because they are either too familiar or too impressionistic and sweeping. The somewhat dogmatic tone in which, for instance, we are informed that 'the true word for Milton's "Paradise Regained" is "Bad"', will please those who like to be told what to think or what parts of Milton's work are not worth reading, and it may irritate others into a profitable reconsideration of their opinions. But Belloc's whole attitude to Milton, as well as his pronouncements and comments upon individual aspects and passages, deserves attention, not least from those who do not share it.

Merritt Y. Hughes has edited *Paradise Lost*⁵ with an intro-

⁴ *Milton*, by Hilaire Belloc. Cassell. pp. 316. 12s.

⁵ *John Milton, Paradise Lost*, ed. by Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Doubleday, Doran. pp. lvi + 412. \$1.

duction which is valuable for its bringing together of what is known and thought about Milton's intellectual habits and background.

Walter Skeat, whose verse translation of *Epitaphium Damonis* appeared in 1933, has now added to it renderings of the *Elegies* and *Silvae*.⁶ These are not less accurate because of some expansions of the Latin and because of the attempted approximation to Milton's own diction and rhythmical habits; and they give an impression of real poetic endowment in the translator.

W. R. Parker's discussion of *Some Problems in the Chronology of Milton's Early Poems* (*R.E.S.*, July) begins with a demonstration that the words 'three and twentieth year' in the Sonnet 'How soon hath time' are compatible with the assignment of this poem to December 1632; and partly on the basis of this finding conclusions are suggested with regard to the dating of other poems published in groups in the editions of 1645 and 1673. It is noteworthy that Parker, like Tillyard, inclines to an earlier date than has usually been accepted for *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. *Arcades* is placed in the early part of 1633.

In an article on *The Latin Pastorals of Milton and Castiglione* (*P.M.L.A.*, June) Thomas Perrin Harrison, Jnr., presents the evidence which he has gathered to show that *Epitaphium Damonis* was affected by Milton's acquaintance with Castiglione's *Alcon*.

It is shown by George W. Whiting in *R.E.S.* (Oct.) that the tract *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England* was *Milton's Reply to Lord Digby*, i.e. that it was mainly directed at *The Third Speech of the Lord Digby* (1640), the argument of which and often the phrases are closely paralleled in Milton's pages. The same scholar, under heading *Milton and that 'learned English Writer'* (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 10), identifies the writer referred to in the same tract *Of Reformation* as Francis Bacon

⁶ *Milton's Lament for Damon and his other Latin Poems rendered into English*, by Walter Skeat, with Preface and Introductions by E. H. Visiak. O.U.P. pp. vi+109. 5s.

(*Certaine Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England*, 1604 and 1640). Whiting also considers in *M.L.R.* (Oct.) *Milton and the 'Postscript'* (sc. to *An Answer to a Booke entituled An Humble Remonstrance*, 1641), maintaining that Milton was not the author. The strongest argument is that the author refers to Bucer's *De Regno Christi*, whereas Milton in 1644 (*The Judgement of Martin Bucer*) states that to the best of his remembrance he had not known Bucer's pronouncements on divorce previously to that year.

Writing *On Milton's Early Literary Programme* in *Mod. Phil.* (Aug.) William R. Parker meets the theory that the well-known passage in *The Reason of Church Government* represents a definite assertion of what Milton intended to do. Parker maintains that taken in its context of an anti-episcopal tract it is rather concerned with 'religious sanction for the three great literary forms which, as an aspirant to poetic honors, he must consider'; a good case is made for the view that the 'brief model' of the epic form mentioned by Milton cannot be regarded as an anticipation of *Paradise Regained*, and it is suggested that Milton probably had not any of his later compositions in mind. Parker also discusses in *J.E.G.P.* (April) *The Trinity Manuscript and Milton's Plans for a Tragedy*. In observing the non-Hellenic features in some of the sketches he is in agreement with Schorck, whose work on this subject was noticed last year (p. 236), but Parker does not draw the same conclusions.

In an article entitled *The Sources of Eikonoklastes: A Resurvey* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.) George W. Whiting opposes the view that Milton was greatly indebted to the fugitive pamphlet *Eikon Alethine* and seeks to show that Milton's work is based rather upon May's *The History of the Parliament of England* (1647) and several other sources consulted 'with industrie and judicious paines'.

George Williamson contributes to *S. in Ph.* (Oct.) a full discussion, having reference to Saurat and others, of *Milton and the Mortalist Heresy*. His main and well realized intention is that of bringing Milton's attitude into relation with the general current of contemporary thought, especially with the denial of divine providence implied in mortalist or Epicurean doctrines of

the day. 'To the complex challenge which was centered but not contained in mortalism, and provoked in an age deeply agitated by the claims of reason, there were many who asserted eternal providence and justified the ways of God to man, but none so audacious as the Milton who incorporated the mortalist heresy into his justification.'

In *P.M.L.A.* (March), under heading *Milton's Debt to Wolleb*, Maurice Kelley presents the results of a thorough study concerning the relations between *De Doctrina Christiana* and Wolleb's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*. Numerous close parallels are adduced to show that the 'debt' was considerable, especially in Milton's Book II, and that the *De Doctrina* is thus less original than has been supposed. It is also shown, however, that Milton's indebtedness was by no means of a slavish order, since he verified his borrowings and incorporated them in a system of his own, depending ultimately upon his reading of the Scriptures. In a concluding paragraph Kelley indicates how the comparison of the two works contributes to a fuller understanding of the *De Doctrina* and its author, and how it substantiates the connexion of Milton's theology with the thought of the Protestant Reformation.

The same writer seeks in his article on *Milton and the Third Person of the Trinity* (*S. in Ph.*, April) to show that although Milton assigned specific functions to that Person it is not to be identified with the Spirit invoked as Milton's 'Muse', which was rather 'a personification of various attributes of God the Father'. Kelley makes much of the assertion in the *De Doctrina*: 'Qui a Patre, non se a seipso, et petitur et datur, nec Deus esse potest, nec invocandus.'

The importance of *Milton's De Doctrina Christiana* for the interpretation of *Paradise Lost* at various points is illustrated again (see *The Year's Work* xv, p. 240) by Kelley in *T.L.S.* (Feb. 21).

Arthur Sewell, writing in *M.L.R.* (Jan.) on *Milton and the Mosaic Law*, traces the evolution of Milton's views concerning the binding force of that Law for regenerate man, who as he came to think needed but the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Sewell argues that it was not until after 1659 that Milton reached the position which he takes up in ch. xxvii of the *De Doctrina*—

'*Tota lex Mosaica aboletur*'—since in the *Treatise of Civil Power* he considers the question 'undecided'; Book XII of *Paradise Lost* shows that he has made up his mind by 1666.

Under heading *Milton and the Rabbinical Bible* Besa R. Dworsky and Theodor Gaster discuss in *T.L.S.* (Apr. 25 and May 9) the possibility that Milton was influenced by the Commentary of Rashi when composing *Paradise Lost*, i. 19–22.

Symmetry in Milton's 'Samson Agonistes' is considered in *M.L.N.* (June) by William R. Parker, who points to various instances in which there is a close correspondence of length between speeches or between sections of single speeches. The same writer argues that *The Kommos of Milton's 'Samson Agonistes'* (*S. in Ph.*, April) extends from line 1660 to the end of the play and not merely to line 1707, the end of the Chorus, since a *kommos* was 'a joint lamentation of Chorus and actors' or, according to later Greek practice, a joint expression of strong emotion. It is further suggested that Aeschylus' *Supplices* provides a near parallel to the form assumed by the *kommos*, thus understood, in *Samson Agonistes*.

P. W. Timberlake's article on *Milton and Euripides*, in *The Parrott Presentation Volume* (see pp. 184–5), gathers up the numerous proofs or hints in Milton's works of his Euripidean study and suggests some reasons why he should have found it congenial.

H. C. Wyld's article in *Eng. Stud.* (April) on *The Significance of 'n and -en in Milton's Spelling*, with a view to ascertaining the poet's pronunciation rather than his text, has been noticed above (Chapter, ii, p. 53).

In an article on *Milton and the Villa Diodati* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.) William S. Clark disposes of the widely accepted legend which connects Milton with the house known to Byron in the district of Cologny, near Geneva. 'No Diodati residence could have been located at Cologny before 1710, while the *Villa Diodati* did not come into existence until close to a half-century after Milton's death.'

J. Milton French contributes to *T.L.S.* (Dec. 21) a Record Office document concerning *An Action against Milton*, in which

Sir Robert Pye in 1646 seeks an injunction against 'one John Melton of London' for hindering the complainant from taking possession of the Forest Hill property apparently mortgaged to both parties by Richard Powell.

T. O. Mabbott considers as *Contemporary Evidence for Royal Favour to Milton* (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 28) the reference by Peter Heimbach in 1666 to honours which Milton had refused.

Edward S. Parsons, editor in 1902 of *The Earliest Life of Milton*, gives in *P.M.L.A.* (Dec.) his reasons for doubting Helen Darbishire's suggestion (in *Early Lives of Milton*, 1932) that *The Authorship of the Anonymous Life of Milton* may be attributed to John Phillips.

To *M.L.N.* (Jan.—*Defoe on Milton*)—Edward G. Fletcher contributes 'two previously unnoted Milton references', one alleging and seeking to account for Milton's preference of *Paradise Regained* to *Paradise Lost*.

Leon Howard records in the *Huntington Library Bulletin* (April) what is known at present about *Early American Copies of Milton*, and deduces from this knowledge a tentative estimate of the extent to which Milton and his works were known in America prior to 1815.

The lengthy article by Ruth C. Wallerstein on *The Development of the Rhetoric and Metre of the Heroic Couplet* in *P.M.L.A.* (March) makes a real contribution to a subject which has often been treated more slightly. It is one thing, for instance, to accept Waller's statement that Fairfax's translation of Tasso had been his model and to observe what he might have learnt from the movement of some of the final couplets in Fairfax's stanzas; but it is more to recognize that Fairfax's versification altogether was of a kind that might justify Waller's assertion, and further to show how the development of the 'closed' couplet went hand in hand with a growing appreciation of its rhetorical and antithetical possibilities. The new harmonies are often found in translation, and Miss Wallerstein makes one excellent point in showing how the translator tended to state in 'more explicit and logically complete terms' the flash of original inspiration which he could not capture for himself. Throughout there is a discriminating sense of the peculiar attainments of

evenness or subtlety in this form by the outstanding exponents, Drayton, Ben Jonson, Sandys, Falkland, Denham, and Waller, and a nice appreciation of the extent to which the closed couplet was established during the first half of the seventeenth century. In a still fuller treatment it would be possible to dwell upon such anticipations as may be found in the concluding couplets of Elizabethan sonnets.

On the strength of MS. 5301 E in the National Library of Wales, Herbert G. Wright (*R.E.S.*, April) is inclined to give an affirmative answer to the question *Was George Herbert the Author of 'Jacula Prudentum'?* The manuscript, which was once in the possession of Sir Henry Herbert, the poet's brother, gives a list of seventy-two proverbs which agree for the most part with the opening pages of the first edition (1640) 'By Mr. G. H.'

Useful work has been done on Richard Crashaw's life and art. His poetic development and his essential poetic gifts are the subject of a careful and valuable study by Ruth C. Wallerstein,⁷ whose object is in part to estimate the effects upon his writings of his attention to neo-Latin and neo-Greek epigram, to Marino, and to emblem and *impresa*. She maintains, however, that although these influences give to his poetry much of its manifest quality, his own meditative habits, his strong religious feeling, and his ecstatic temperament were of more fundamental importance; these may come to expression as striking interruptions of his earlier and more imitative or derivative endeavours, and they are allowed full and masterly play in the St. Teresa poems attributed to his latest period. The true understanding of Crashaw's poetry calls for a fuller knowledge of his life and reading than is yet available, and Miss Wallerstein perhaps relies too firmly on the meagre findings of her predecessors. Some of her statements seem a little questionable, as that Wordsworth's Immortality Ode owes much to Crashaw. But the main drift of her argument, in the course of which fresh suggestions are made on points of major or minor interest, is clearly and persuasively set forth.

⁷ *Richard Crashaw: A Study in Style and Poetic Development*, by Ruth C. Wallerstein (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 37). Madison. pp. 160. \$2.00.

Austin Warren (*T.L.S.*, Nov. 16) gives good reasons for his belief that Crashaw himself was not responsible for the alteration of the original (1646) heading of 'An Apologie for the precedent Hymne' ('Hymnes' 1648), viz. on St. Teresa, which heading in *Carmen Deo Nostro*, 1652, i.e. subsequently to the poet's death, is enlarged by the addition of 'as hauing been writt when the author was yet among the protestantes'. The poem itself in no way justifies this addition which, as Warren points out, may have resulted from a conjecture of Thomas Carr, the editor of *Carmen Deo Nostro*.

The same writer shows in *Mod. Phil.* (Feb.) the likelihood that *Richard Crashaw* was ordained by the Bishop of Ely, becoming a priest not later than 1639, when he was made Curate of Little St. Mary's, Cambridge ('Curate' seeming to convey the modern sense of assistant or deputy). That he continued to serve Little St. Mary's until his departure from Cambridge in 'January, 1643', may be inferred from the fact that in April 1642 the Fellows of Peterhouse elected him 'catechist and curate' for the ensuing year, 'catechist' in Warren's view meaning here primarily 'theological tutor or lecturer'. In these ecclesiastical capacities he would have ample opportunities for earning the reputation described by David Lloyd in 1668 for 'thronged Sermons on each Sunday and Holiday, that ravished more like Poems . . . scattering not so much Sentences as Extasies, his soul breathing in each word'. It may be added that the style of the prose letter which he wrote from Leyden in February '1643' lends credibility to this account of the alleged sermons.

The relations between *Vaughan* and *Wordsworth* are considered in *R.E.S.* (July) by Helen N. McMaster, who believes, justly in the view of the present writer, that too much has been made of the similarities between 'The Retreate' and the Immortality Ode. Even if it be a fact that Wordsworth owned a copy of *Silex Scintillans* it has yet to be proved that he was influenced by it, and, as Miss McMaster points out, it is noteworthy that Wordsworth nowhere mentions Vaughan and did not include anything by him in the *Poems and Extracts* (first published in 1905). The differences between the two poems

most in question are also shown to deserve more consideration than they have sometimes received.

A short treatise by Q. Iredale on Thomas Traherne⁸ as poet and as philosopher is concerned largely with that poet's conception of nature and its expression in verse and in prose. His philosophy, which sometimes hampered the poetic artist, 'permeated the whole of his work; but the keystone of his philosophy was the poet's experience of nature'. Perhaps the most valuable part of this work is the chapter on 'Development from Books', in which the quality and effects of his 'Belesenheit' are briefly estimated.

Mention should have been made last year of a Traherne anthology,⁹ with an illuminating introduction by 'Q'.

The book of skilful translations into Danish verse of Herrick's poems by Viggo J. von Holstein Rathlou, first published in 1907, has now been enlarged¹⁰ to comprise about two hundred and fifty pieces.

Writing on *The Source of Quarles's Emblems* in *Library* (Sept.) Gordon S. Haight considers the engravings with reference to the original *Pia Desideria* and *Typus Mundi*. Some of the modifications appear to turn upon the friendship between Quarles, Benlowes, and Phineas Fletcher; most of them were made to adapt the plates to Quarles's poems, and contemporary circumstances are perhaps reflected in one or two. Haight also discusses the influence of the original texts, believing that its extent has been exaggerated. He observes, too, that Books I and II, which are indebted to *Typus Mundi*, were written after the other three books and just at the time of Quarles's first acquaintance with Fletcher, whose verse forms are here followed. The general influence of Sylvester in matter and style is also affirmed.

⁸ *Thomas Traherne*, by Q. Iredale. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 87. 5s.

⁹ *Felicities of Thomas Traherne*, ed. by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. 1934. Dobell. pp. xxix+114. 3s.

¹⁰ *Hesperider og Noble Numre af den Britiske Poët Robert Herrick, oversat til Dansk*, by Dr. Viggo J. von Holstein Rathlou. Copenhagen: Poul Branner, pp. v+116. 5.75 kr.

The same writer shows in *T.L.S.* (April 11) the difficulty involved in the statement by Quarles's widow that he served as cupbearer to the Queen of Bohemia, seeing that another name is associated with that office in the German State Papers at the Record Office. Quarles was, however, among the Earl of Arundel's train when the Earl attended the Princess on her journey to Heidelberg in 1612/13 after her marriage. In *T.L.S.* (Oct. 17) Haight presents evidence that the poet's sojourn in Ireland as secretary to Ussher began in 1626 and lasted until the winter 1629/30 and not, as it has seemed from Fuller's *Worthies*, until 1641.

Robert Lathrop Sharp contributes *Observations on Metaphysical Imagery* to the *Sewanee Review* (Oct.-Dec.) and illustrates the treatment by metaphysical poets of imagery which they inherited from the Elizabethans.

A valuable addition to the number of printed seventeenth-century diaries is made in the publishing from the manuscript in the Queen's College Library of the diary¹¹ made from 1626 to 1640 and from 1653 to 1654 by Thomas Crosfield, Fellow of the College 1627-c.1640 and Rector of Spennithorne, Yorkshire, 1649-63. Hitherto extracts only have been available; F. S. Boas, who supplies a full introduction and notes, now presents all the most interesting portions, amounting to about three-fourths of the whole. Crosfield shows the width of his interests by adding to his record of circumstances and incidents of College and University life comments upon affairs of church and state in England and elsewhere, and items concerning amusements and spectacles, especially music and the drama. Thus he gives some information not otherwise known about the five chief London companies of players, derived from a member of the King's Revels Company, who visited Oxford in 1634; and he provides what Boas describes as 'one of the most comprehensive lists of Elizabethan card-games', without disturbing the impression that he was a true lover of learning and a conscientious teacher.

¹¹ *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, ed. by Frederick S. Boas. O.U.P. for Royal Society of Literature. pp. xxix+169. 12s. 6d.

The story of Thomas Fuller's life, presented in great detail by John Eglington Bailey in 1874, is retold¹² by Dean B. Lyman, who has aimed at and appears to have achieved 'an adequate, carefully documented, concise and readable biography' and 'the establishment of a more accurate chronology' of the events than has hitherto been available. The volume should be serviceable, especially to those who cannot refer to Bailey's work.

The works of John Layer, who gathered materials in the early seventeenth century for a History of Cambridgeshire, have no great literary value, but it is well that the ascertained facts of his life and writings should have been assembled and enlarged.¹³ Layer was evidently an antiquary of some accomplishment and repute, whose collections are still valuable to local historians, and Dr. Palmer's account of him appears to have been put together with great care.

A Scots Sermon-Squib, containing references to ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland in 1638 and discussed at length by W. Fraser Mitchell in *T.L.S.* (June 13 and Oct. 24), is the 'Pockmanty' or 'Red-Shankes' Sermon, which if not falsely dated 1642 is the earliest specimen of its kind. Mitchell raises the question whether an edition dated 1733 may be connected with Swift or some member of his circle.

In *A Note on Thomas May* (*R.E.S.*, April) C. H. Wilkinson gives reasons for his opinion that May was the author of *A True Relation of the late Expedition of His Excellency, Robert Earle of Essex, for the Relief of Gloucester. With The Description of the Fight at Newbury* (1643).

A. T. Shillinglaw, referring to Łubienski's *Die Grundlagen des ethisch-politischen Systems von Hobbes* (*The Year's Work*, xiv, p. 243), argues in *Eng. Stud.* (Jan.) 'against supposing that any considerable part of *Leviathan* existed in Latin before being written in English'.

John Carter gives in *T.L.S.* (Aug. 22) an account of one more

¹² *The Great Tom Fuller*, by Dean B. Lyman. Univ. of California and O.U. Presses. pp. xii+198. 10s.

¹³ *John Layer (1586–1640) of Shepreth, Cambridgeshire, a Seventeenth-Century Local Historian*, by W. M. Palmer. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society. pp. 121. 10s. 6d.

copy of Browne's *Urne-Buriall* (1658) carrying corrections in the author's hand; these confirm the corrections observed in the six copies previously examined and described (*The Year's Work*, xiv, p. 247).

A careful reissue (not a mere reprint) of the enlarged *Compleat Angler*, the 'Fifth Edition' (1676), typographically contemporary with that edition and containing all its cuts, is now available in the World's Classics series.¹⁴ The Oxford Press has thus performed a service to scholars besides gratifying the 'common reader' who would have not only the words but the flavour of the original edition.

The Commonwealth period is naturally attractive at present to German students of English history and literature. Cromwell, regarded as a type of the modern Führer, is the subject of one work,¹⁵ Harrington's *Oceana* of another, in which the Germanic quality and origins of Harrington's conception are emphasized,¹⁶ and in a third¹⁷ Henry More provides for the author a sad example of gifts and energies wasted in other-worldly speculations at a time when more Cromwells and Miltons were needed to make England safe for National-Socialist ideals.

The following entries refer to abstracts of dissertations: *Milton and Ovid*, by M. C. Brill (Cornell); *John Donne the Rhetor*, by A. M. Wasilefsky (Cornell); *A Collection and Explanation of the Folklore in Milton's English Poems*, by E. C. Kirkland (Northwestern University); *Sir Thomas Browne of the Religio Medici*, by W. L. McKnight (Pittsburg); *Scientific Rationalism in the Seventeenth Century*, by Jacob H. Abers (Stanford University).

¹⁴ *The Compleat Angler*. By Izaak Walton and Charles Cotton, introduction by John Buchan. O.U.P. pp. xxiv + 322. 2s.

¹⁵ *Cromwell: Vier Essays über die Führung einer Nation*, by H. Oncken. Berlin: G. Grote. pp. vi + 147.

¹⁶ *James Harrington und sein Wunschbild vom germanischen Staate*, by Christian Wershofen. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung. Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie. pp. 73. RM. 3.

¹⁷ *Henry More in Cambridge*, by Heinz Günther Jentsch. (Göttingen diss.) pp. 95.

By F. S. BOAS

IN vol. xiii, p. 219, of *The Year's Work* mention was made of the appearance of the first six volumes of the Columbia University edition of Milton's complete works,¹⁸ and of the critical canons on which it was based. During the period 1932-4 nine further volumes have been issued, though it is to be noted that these do not include xi-xii, which are to follow, as also the concluding vol. xviii. Except for the Histories of Britain and Moscovia the nine volumes contain prose works in Latin, with an English translation either specially written for this edition or adapted from an earlier version. Notes are added on the Latin texts and the translations, including in vol. xvii the detailed notes by C. R. Sumner on his version of *De Doctrina Christiana*, slightly revised and augmented. All students of Milton will look forward to the early completion of this splendid achievement of American scholarship.

¹⁸ *The Works of John Milton*. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. General editor, Frank Allen Patterson; editors: Allan Abbott, Harry Morgan Ayres, Donald Lemen Clark, John Erskine, William Haller, George Philip Krapp, W. P. Trent. Vol. vii, *Joannis Miltoni Angli Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, ed. by Clinton W. Keyes, with a translation by Samuel Lee Wolff, pp. 587; vols. viii and ix, *Defensio Secunda* and *Pro Se Defensio*, ed. by Eugene J. Strittmatter, with the translation by George Burnett, 1809, revised by Moses Hadas, pp. 266, 308; vol. x, *The History of Britain* and *A Brief History of Moscovia*, ed. by G. P. Krapp, pp. 387; vol. xi, *Artis Logicae Plenior Institutio*, ed. and translated by Allan H. Gilbert, pp. 538; vols. xiv-xvii, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. by James Holly Hanford and Waldo Hilary Dunn, with the translation of Charles R. Sumner. pp. 403, 409, 381, 587. 1932-4. To be completed in 18 vols., £24 the set.

X

THE RESTORATION

By F. E. BUDD

THE two facts which stand out most prominently from a survey of Restoration studies for 1935 are that the fascination of the drama is as compelling as ever and that scholarly interest in Pepys as a man of affairs is increasing. Among the poets Rochester enjoys an unusual degree of attention. There is, too, an important treatise from France on the changes in the intellectual outlook of Europe during the period 1680–1715.

Montague Summers has followed up his volume on *The Restoration Theatre*, wherein he was concerned with the management and mechanics of the playhouse (see *The Year's Work*, xv. 251–2), with a lengthy discussion of the plays and playwrights of the years 1660–82. (Dryden and the heroic drama are, however, withheld for inclusion in a later volume of Summers's serial history.) *The Playhouse of Pepys*¹ falls into five chapters. The first is concerned with Davenant's work as dramatist and producer in Caroline and Commonwealth times, for where authors were productive before as well as after 1660 Summers pays due attention to their early work, and so brings out the continuity of the dramatic tradition. Davenant's managerial activities after 1660, the career of Thomas Killigrew, and the history of the public theatres until the union of the Duke's Company and the King's Company in 1682 are narrated in full detail in the second chapter. The remaining three chapters, occupying 300 pages, are devoted to the dramatists who wrote for these companies. Summers rejects 'any purely artificial segregation' of their plays under 'clouterly headings of groups or imaginary tendencies' (e.g. 'Tragedy and Opera', 'Jonsonian Element'), and instead considers his authors 'more or less biographically'. What this means is not made clear, but in actual practice Summers compromises between a chronological and a qualitative division, his last three chapters dealing respectively with 'The

¹ *The Playhouse of Pepys*, by Montague Summers. Kegan Paul. pp. xv + 485. 21s.

'Earlier Restoration Dramatists', 'The Top-wits and the Men of Quality', and 'The Minor Dramatists'. Such a division proves less helpful than the one rejected. In dealing with individual authors Summers accumulates the details of their biography (often adding to existing information), narrates at some length the plots of their plays, and gives particulars of the sources, the performers, and the stage-history. The result is an encyclopaedic rather than a critical survey, and any curiosity that the student may have concerning the substance of obscure and not easily accessible plays will be readily satisfied by reference to this exhaustive volume. Its literary judgements, however, should not always be accepted without question, for Summers is as reluctant to admit that there are any bad plays as that there are any good present-day critics of the Restoration period.

From the same author comes *A Bibliography of the Restoration Drama*,² a useful list of plays acted or unacted, published or in manuscript, for the years 1660-1700. If a dramatist has but one play first acted or published within those limits, the whole of his dramatic works are included. The original date and place of production of acted plays are given where possible, as are all editions that appeared during an author's lifetime. Later editions of any significance and all recent editions are, it is claimed, recorded. Omissions can, however, be found; for instance, Summers's own edition of Otway is listed, but not the more recent one by J. C. Ghosh. Summers himself repairs certain omissions of plays in his *Bibliographies and Checklists* (*T.L.S.*, April 25).

Milton C. Nahm's edition of the Worcester College MS. of John Wilson's *The Cheats*³ is valuable both for its introductory monograph on the dramatist and for its presentation for the first time of a prompt-copy text of considerable interest for its illustration of the methods of Restoration censorship. A long opening chapter gives in considerable detail the facts of Wilson's

² *A Bibliography of the Restoration Drama*, by Montague Summers. Fortune Press. pp. 143. 15s.

³ John Wilson's 'The Cheats', ed. by Milton C. Nahm from the MS. in the Library of Worcester College, Oxford. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. ix + 280. 10s. 6d.

life, to which Nahm's own researches have made important contributions. This is followed by a discussion of the conditions under which *The Cheats* was acted and by a study of the sources. Nahm shows that Wilson was a 'son of Ben' both in his general approach to drama and in his detailed borrowings and imitations. Wilson's debts to other predecessors are also closely investigated, with the result that little is left to Wilson himself except credit for making good use of his loans. Nahm then turns to textual problems, and presents the results of his collation of the Worcester College MS. with the four quartos. He shows that the former, the playhouse copy bearing the censorial marks of Sir Henry Herbert, was almost completely rewritten and that a new manuscript was prepared for submission to L'Estrange for licence to print. In the process of revision not only were old speeches modified, fresh ones added, new literary allusions inserted, and spelling and punctuation changed to conform to the printer's practice, but the last scene was rewritten and the conclusion of the play thereby radically altered. It is interesting to note that L'Estrange allowed for publication all the material marked for deletion by Herbert. Nahm's text of the play follows, with slight modifications, the playhouse copy, and carefully reproduces its distinctive features, including the alterations of the prompter and of Herbert. Needless to say, such a text is designed for the specialist who has already formed his literary judgement of the play from one of the quartos specifically prepared by Wilson for the reader. In an appendix Nahm gives important additions first appearing in the quartos, and there is a section of explanatory notes and commentary.

Albert S. Borgman's biography of William Mountfort⁴ is modestly offered as an 'extended footnote' to Colley Cibber's eulogy of this promising young actor in his *Apology*. Borgman has little to add to the few facts already known about Mountfort's private life. In concentrating on his theatrical career, Borgman's method is to give detailed accounts not only of the four plays from Mountfort's pen, but also of all those in which

⁴ *The Life and Death of William Mountfort*, by Albert S. Borgman. (Harvard Studies in English, xv.) Harvard Univ. and O.U. Presses. pp. 221. 10s. 6d.

he is known to have performed, however unimportant his role. This information is frequently interesting in itself, if not always strictly relevant to Mountfort's biography. Borgman's difficulty in expanding a footnote to the scope of a volume is suggested again by the fact that he has to devote over seventy pages of text and appendix to the unhappy story of Mountfort's death at the hands of Captain Richard Hill. This has been told at length before, but Borgman is able to add a few vivifying details from manuscript sources.

Among the articles and notes concerned with Restoration drama T. C. Macaulay's *French and English Drama in the Seventeenth Century: Some Contrasts and Parallels (Essays and Studies, xx)* is perhaps the most interesting to the non-specialist student. With keen critical insight he discusses notable developments in the two national dramas during the century, and stresses the fact that they remained in all essentials wholly dissimilar. He notes, as especially characteristic of English drama of the Restoration, the elevation of wit, which was not generally indulged in French comedy, the persistence of the more robust qualities of earlier seventeenth-century drama, and the wise refusal of the tragic writers to be limited (particularly in their characterization) by the unities of Time and Place.

In *The Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660–1700* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.) Sybil Rosenfeld transcribes and classifies items of theatrical interest from newspapers in the Burney and Bodleian collections and from Motteux's *Gentleman's Journal*. The section on 'Special Performances and Playhouse News' contains several references to royal and ambassadorial visits to the theatre, and records the occasionally fatal outbursts of rowdyism that marred performances. Another section of 'Biographical Details' includes official announcements by the Master of the Revels, while the extracts from Motteux provide agreeable chit-chat about the plays and playwrights of the moment.

A. L. Bader, in *The Modena Troupe in England* (*M.L.N.*, June), quotes from a Public Record Office document the names of the Italian comedians who visited England in 1678. W. J. Lawrence warns theatrical historians that no inferences con-

cerning Restoration methods of staging can safely be drawn from the plates in Settle's *The Empress of Morocco* (*T.L.S.*, July 11). In 'The Princess of Cleve' and *Sentimental Comedy* (*R.E.S.*, April) Thomas B. Stroup finds Lee's so-called tragedy, acted in 1681, to be interesting as an early instance of the transition from the heroic play to sentimental comedy. The Duke Nemours in this play is identified with Rochester by Graham Greene (*Rochester and Lee*, *T.L.S.*, Nov. 2), who submits fresh evidence in support of the similarity first noted by Montague Summers. W. J. Lawrence comments on the dates given in Greene's letter (*ibid.*, Nov. 9). John C. Hodges, in a note *On the Date of Congreve's Birth* (*Mod. Phil.*, Aug.), argues in favour of Malone's date of February 1670. *Two Wycherley Letters*, dated 1677 and 1685 and addressed to the Earl of Mulgrave, are transcribed by Robert J. Allen from the Orrery Papers in the Harvard College Library (*T.L.S.*, April 18). The possibility that he was educated at St. Paul's School is mentioned by Ivan Mavor in *Wycherley and St. Paul's School* (*ibid.*, Nov. 9). Edward N. Hooker, in *Dryden's Allusion to the Poet of Excessive Wit* (*N. and Q.*, June 15), quotes Dennis's statement that the poet referred to in the *Parallel of Poetry and Painting* was Wycherley and that the particular reference was to *The Plain Dealer*. In *Some Notes on Dryden, Cowley, and Shadwell* (*ibid.*, Feb. 9) Harold Brooks quotes allusions to these poets from the anonymous *Marriage Asserted* (1674) and *Remarks upon Remarques* (1673). Paul B. Anderson, in *Buckingham's Chemist* (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 3), gives some particulars of the miscellaneous literary activity, which included play writing, of Dr. Peter Bellon.

The more important of this year's Dryden studies also relate to the sphere of drama. Ned Bliss Allen, believing that Dryden's comedies have never received their due proportion of the critical study devoted to their author and suspecting errors and omissions in the comments of previous critics, has attempted to remedy these shortcomings in his study of the sources of the comedies.⁵ He has investigated, as well as the unmixed comedies, the comic plots of the tragi-comedies. He does not claim

⁵ *The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies*, by Ned Bliss Allen. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press. pp. xvii + 298. \$3.00.

very great ability for Dryden as a comic dramatist, nor any consistent development. Dryden's one constant principle was to please the changing tastes of his audiences, and to do this with as little exercise of originality as possible. 'It is probably safe to say that in his comedies Dryden never created what he could borrow.' In tracing these borrowings Allen follows up the clues provided by Langbaine in his *Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (1691), his justification being that this has not previously been done at all adequately and that in consequence Dryden has been given credit for more originality than he possessed. On the comedies for which Langbaine or subsequent critics have failed to detect sources Allen has little new to say—not, however, because he believes their plots to be original. Although a great deal of his volume is occupied by the discussion of detailed parallels of phrasing and incident, he also indicates Dryden's debts to the spirit and dramatic method of his predecessors and contemporaries. In appendixes the sources of the serious plots of *The Maiden Queen* and *Marriage à la Mode* and the indebtedness of *Amphitryon* to Plautus and Molière are dealt with. The suggestion is also made that Woodall, in *Mr. Limberham*, is a satirical portrait of Rochester.

An interesting article by P. S. Havens on Dryden's 'Tagged' Version of '*Paradise Lost*'⁶ throws new light on Dryden's purpose in composing *The State of Innocence and Fall of Man*. This was, Havens argues, to test his theory that 'an heroic play ought to be an imitation, in little, of an heroic poem'. The experiment was for his private instruction, and publication was forced upon him only when garbled versions got abroad. The method of his adaptation of Milton's epic to dramatic requirements is carefully studied. In *Author's Changes in Dryden's 'Conquest of Granada'*, Part I (M.L.N., June) George H. Nettleton calls attention to four significant alterations in the text of the second quarto of 1673, and attributes them to Dryden, who normally did not revise his plays for fresh editions. In *Massinger and Dryden* (E.L.H., Nov.) Charles E. Ward submits that Dryden's *Tyrannic Love, or The Royal Martyr* was influenced by Massinger's *The Virgin Martyr*.

⁶ In *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume* (see pp. 184–5).

Dryden's non-dramatic work receives relatively little attention except in two valuable articles by Roswell G. Ham. In *Dryden as Historiographer-Royal: The Authorship of 'His Majesties Declaration Defended', 1681* (R.E.S., July) Ham deduces, from the practice of James Howell, Dryden's predecessor in the office, the type of publication that might be expected from the historiographer-royal, and names certain of Dryden's authentic works in verse and prose which may be regarded as arising from his sense of an historiographer's duty. Ham then adduces evidence for Dryden's labours, in his official capacity, on an unpublished narrative of James II's early years, and proceeds to the most important section of his paper, a persuasive exposition of the external and internal evidence in favour of the probability of Dryden's authorship of the anonymously published pamphlet, *His Majesties Declaration Defended*. In *Dryden's Dedication for 'The Music of the Prophetesse', 1691* (P.M.L.A., Dec.) he prints from a manuscript in, as he believes, Dryden's autograph, a dedication published as Purcell's, and suggests that Dryden was its author. A comparison of the manuscript and the printed versions, reinforced by the citation of parallels with Dryden's other writings, enables Ham to throw interesting light on the author's methods of composition.

G. M. Turnell's *Dryden and the Religious Elements in the Classical Tradition* (Eng. Stud., Aug.) is primarily concerned with Dryden's attitude towards authority in religion and literature. Edward G. Fletcher quotes *A Dryden Anecdote* relating to Buckingham's supposed treatment of Dryden for portraying him as Zimri, the source being Defoe's *Review*, 17 May 1712 (M.L.N., June). Coleman O. Parsons prints *Dryden's Letter of Attorney*, 1680, whereby he appointed George Ward to collect for him the payments due on his pensions (*ibid.*, June). In *When did Dryden write 'Mac Flecknoe'?—Some Additional Notes* (R.E.S., Jan.) Harold Brooks argues in favour of 1678, quoting parallels in *Rochester's Farewell* and in Oldham's satires, and showing reason why Oldham's dating of his transcript of *Mac Flecknoe* in 1678 should carry weight in fixing this as the year of composition.

John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, is the subject of two substantial biographies. Charles Williams⁷ presents, with humour and a measure of detachment, a convincing picture of this explosive personality, whose brief life of intensive devotion to sense and sensuality ended with an exemplary death-bed conversion. Williams claims for him a consistent vein of seriousness, and tends to represent his licentious and sometimes brutal escapades (most of which are amusingly described) as not the thoughtless indulgences of a debauchee, but the deliberate conduct of a Hobbist experimenting in sensation. At other times Rochester's inquiring mind endeavoured to test by experiment the possible existence of an after life, but the lack of positive results merely confirmed him in the material enjoyment of the fleeting moments of the present one. When the physical incapacity resulting from over-indulgence robbed this of its charms and sensation was found to be deceptive, Rochester began serious reading, turned his mind to the duties of his station, and began those conversations with Burnet which led him to decide to reform. Isaiah liii, read to him during his last sickness by his chaplain, effected the complete conversion for which Burnet had prepared the way. The ecstasy of religious fervour which marked his last days Williams describes fairly but without enthusiasm, and he regrets the penitent's over-zealous destruction of some of the racier writings of his unregenerate youth.

Vivian de Sola Pinto is a more fervent admirer of Rochester as poet and philosopher than is Williams, and the inspiring motive of his volume⁸ is to establish Rochester in the role of serious poet and thinker. This occasions a change of emphasis in dealing with parts of the biographical material which the two authors have in common. Pinto, too, gives more detail in his interesting narrative, particularly on the topic of Rochester's youthful foreign tour under the tutelage of Sir Andrew Balfour —although, as he admits in a note, it is not absolutely certain that Balfour's *Letters* (1700), from which he reconstructs the itinerary, describe the journey with Rochester. Pinto reads into the correspondence between Rochester and his wife a far more

⁷ *Rochester*, by Charles Williams. Arthur Barker. pp. 274. 10s. net.

⁸ *Rochester: Portrait of a Restoration Poet*, by Vivian de Sola Pinto. John Lane. pp. xxii + 294. 8s. 6d. net.

tender relationship than Williams admits, and he suggests that some of Rochester's best poems were written to her. Rochester's writings are generously quoted by Pinto, with the result that his book combines with its biographical interest the advantages of an anthology. Some modernization of the punctuation of the poems quoted from manuscript would, however, have assisted the reader. The tone of the literary criticism is determined by Pinto's conviction of Rochester's poetic and intellectual greatness, and his enthusiastic pleading, even though it does not always compel agreement, should do much to establish Rochester not merely as a love poet of occasional genius and a vigorous satirist, but also as a significant constructive thinker in verse. Little mention is made of Rochester's erotic poetry, on which other critics have perhaps laid more than sufficient emphasis. Pinto favours Rochester again in his tendency to view his whole career in the light of his spectacular conversion ('That experience is the culmination of his career, and all this poetry must be read in the light of it', p. 257). Nevertheless, one of the most valuable features of his volume is his study of Rochester's reaction from his first intellectual love, the philosophy of Hobbes, to the sceptical deism of his friend Charles Blount (of whose three letters to 'Strephon' or Rochester, Pinto is the first to make use), and then, after his conversations with Burnet, to the full acceptance of revealed Christianity in his last days.

A briefer exposition of some of the critical opinions noted above will be found in Pinto's *The Poetry of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*,⁹ not noticed last year. In *Attributions to Rochester* (T.L.S., May 9) Harold Brooks notes the source of 'The Commons' Petition' and shows that 'Upon the Author of the Play call'd Sodom' was written by Oldham, not Rochester. C. H. Wilkinson's *Lord Rochester* (*ibid.*, July 11) deals with poems in *The Triumph of Wit*, 1688.

The only other articles concerned with poetry relate to the canon of Dorset's writings. In *Dorset's Poem 'On the Young Statesmen'* (*ibid.*, April 4) Brice Harris, after rejecting the possibilities that Dryden, Rochester, or Buckingham was the author of the piece, submits evidence for ascribing it to Dorset. R. G.

⁹ In *Essays by Divers Hands*, ed. by W. B. Maxwell. Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. Vol. xiii. O.U.P. 1934. 7s.

Howarth notes, from manuscript sources, *Some Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset* (M.L.N., Nov.), in amplification of Helen A. Bagley's *Checklist* (see *The Year's Work*, xiii. 235).

Among the prose writers Pepys commands the major share of attention, and Pepysians will specially welcome *Samuel Pepys: The Years of Peril*,¹⁰ the second of the three volumes in which Arthur Bryant's biography will be completed. The first volume brought the story of Pepys's life down to the close of the Diary (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 271-3); the present volume carries it on until the eve of the Tangier voyage in 1683; and the final volume will deal with Pepys as 'Saviour of the Navy'. Bryant again shows notable skill and judgement in handling the mass of material which he has accumulated from published and manuscript sources. An introductory chapter neatly depicts the political situation in the mid-Restoration period. Pepys, in spite of his lowly origin, 'was now at the age of thirty-seven the recognized driving force of the Navy Office, Treasurer of Tangier, and a man of great influence and authority'. But authority spelt danger, and an admirable character sketch enables us to appreciate the qualities which enabled him to face undauntedly the political attacks upon himself and his colleagues which loom so large in the troubled years covered by this volume. Pepys's administrative genius, sorely tested during the Third Dutch War, was given full scope by his elevation in 1673 to the post of Secretary to the Office of the Lord High Admiral, an appointment which 'ultimately produced results which affected not England alone, but the whole world', for Pepys was to lay the administrative foundation of the modern navy. In the same year he entered Parliament, where his enemies, seizing every opportunity to attack him on public and religious grounds, found him a most redoubtable fighter. In spite of all discouragements, he steadily pursued his wise policy of reforming and developing the navy. Then came the disaster of the Popish Plot, and Pepys, on account of his long association with the Duke of York in admiralty affairs, was made a principal object of Whig attack in Parliament. He was committed to the Tower, and,

¹⁰ *Samuel Pepys: The Years of Peril*, by Arthur Bryant. C.U.P. pp. xv + 466. 12s. 6d.

though the long prosecution for treason finally petered out, his enemies succeeded in ejecting him from office. Pepys was now left to his private devices until, in 1683, the king recalled him to public service for the purpose of the Tangier Voyage. Packed as the whole of this attractive book is with fresh information, Bryant nowhere throws more valuable light on the age and the man than in his detailed tracing of Pepys's vicissitudes under the ruthless intrigues of the Whigs in the time of the Plot. In an appendix he publishes for the first time Pepys's account of 'The Present Ill State of my Health', 7 Nov. 1677.

Edwin Chappell has substantially increased his contributions to Pepysian studies by his edition of *The Tangier Papers*.¹¹ Dissatisfied with Smith's original edition of *The Tangier Journal* (1841), Chappell has transcribed the shorthand afresh and collated his version with one made independently by W. Matthews. To the *Journal* he has added a mass of miscellaneous documents relating to the expedition, written by various hands and of purely historical interest, and Pepys's 'Notes General of the Navy', which occupy half the volume. These show Pepys's zeal in gathering information on any and every aspect of naval life and organization. Chappell's editorial apparatus includes an introductory sketch of the history of Tangier as an English possession and of Pepys's share in Dartmouth's expedition for its abandonment, some brief biographical notes on the persons mentioned in Pepys's narrative, and a useful index.

Clara Marburg's *Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn*¹² is a study of the 'publick employment' and 'private enjoyment' of these two men from the time of Pepys's first mention of Evelyn in his Diary, in 1665, until his death nearly forty years later. Though they were as unlike in personality and ability as they well could be, their respect for each other's qualities ripened into an uninterrupted friendship that seems to have given them both very

¹¹ *The Tangier Papers of Samuel Pepys*, transcribed, edited, and collated with the transcription of Mr. W. Matthews, by Edwin Chappell. (Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. lxxiii.) pp. xlix+376. 25s. 6d.

¹² *Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn*, by Clara Marburg. Pennsylvania Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xi+156. 9s.

real pleasure and consolation, especially in their later years. Miss Marburg's story makes attractive reading, but the real purpose of her book is to print for the first time thirty-seven letters between Pepys and Evelyn which she has collected from the manuscripts of the Public Record Office, the British Museum, the Pepysian Library, and a few other sources. Ten are by Pepys and the rest, including the longest, by Evelyn. Most are concerned with their business relations in the matter of the care of the sick and wounded, but the longest arise from their private interests (e.g. Evelyn's letter in which, on the eve of Pepys's trip to France in 1669, he gives detailed advice as to the sights which Pepys should on no account miss, and the 'imethodicall Trifle' of pamphlet size in which he answers Pepys's abstruse inquiries of 7 July 1680 relating to naval history). Miss Marburg prints all of these letters in full in an appendix, while other appendixes give 'finding lists' of unlocated or inaccessible manuscript letters and of printed letters. Certain errors in these lists are pointed out in a review in *T.L.S.* (Dec. 7).

In *Mr. Pepys upon the State of Christ-Hospital*¹³ Rudolf Kirk gives the history of Pepys's association with Christ's Hospital during the last thirty years of his life. His principal new sources of information are Pepys's voluminous manuscript 'Collection of Matters relating to Christ's Hospital', covering the years 1673–84, and the minute-books of the school. Pepys's interest as a governor was concentrated on the Mathematical School which Charles II established at the hospital on 19 August 1673 for the instruction of forty poor boys in 'the art of navigation and the whole science of arithmetic'. These boys were designed to become navigating officers in the navy, which accounts for the devotion with which Pepys endeavoured to safeguard their interests. But even he was for a long period (1684–92) reduced to apathy by the corruption, mismanagement, and inefficiency of the school. When he was persuaded once more to resume his activities as a governor, he made valiant efforts towards its reform, only to find that the one way to get any attention paid to the elaborate Report which he drew up was to go over the

¹³ *Mr. Pepys upon the State of Christ-Hospital*, by Rudolf Kirk. Pennsylvania Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xi + 65 + facsimiles. 9s.

heads of the president and other governors and appeal directly to the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen. This he did in a series of letters printed at his own expense and circulated privately. In an appendix Kirk prints these in facsimile from a set in the Bodleian Library; only two other sets, of which one is imperfect, are known to exist. Pepys did not live to see his reforms accomplished, but his strenuous efforts on behalf of the school, in spite of many other calls on his time and of failing health, confirm the impression of Pepys as the devoted servant of the public good which Bryant has emphasized.

In *Samuel Pepys and his Link with the Huguenots* (*Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, vol. xv, no. 2) W. H. Manchée suggests the possibility that Pepys belonged to a Huguenot family. Manchée's researches into contemporary records, particularly those of the Huguenot churches in London and Canterbury, enable him to throw light on Pepys's circle of friends and relations, which certainly contains a large Huguenot element. Edwin Chappell, in *Pepys and the Huguenots*, corrects two statements in Manchée's paper (*N. and Q.*, Nov. 2), and in *Pepysiana* (*T.L.S.*, March 14) he corrects other statements appearing in *The Times* on 11 and 25 February. In *Samuel Pepys and Spain* (*Neophilologus*, Jan.) W. Matthews illustrates the views on Spain and its customs which Pepys recorded during his visit at the close of his Tangier labours, 1683. Pepys's comments are here for the first time published from Matthews's own transcription of Bodleian MS. Rawlinson c. 859. The same writer, in *Pepys's Transcribers* (*J.E.G.P.*, April), discusses the successive transcriptions of Pepys's shorthand from Pepys's own versions of Charles II's escape from Worcester until the present day. John Smith is shown to have worked 'with astounding care and skill', only to have his excellent transcription of the Diary mangled and corrupted by Braybrooke. Mynors Bright merely emended and expanded the text of Braybrooke's 1854 edition. Chappell's *Shorthand Letters of Samuel Pepys*, 1933 (see *The Year's Work*, xiv. 273) is given 'the distinction of being the only scholarly Pepysian transcription yet printed'. As the above notes will have shown, *The Tangier Papers* must now share this distinction, and Matthews's own name must be added to Chappell's in connexion with it.

An interesting addition to the corpus of Restoration diaries is that of Robert Hooke, now edited for the first time by Henry W. Robinson and Walter Adams from the manuscript preserved in the Guildhall Library.¹⁴ Robert Hooke, whose life (1635–1703) is admirably sketched in the introduction, was a member of that group of scientists who regularly foregathered in private at Oxford in the later 1650's and who, after the Restoration, formed the nucleus of the Royal Society. Hooke's genius in conducting experiments and in devising necessary apparatus proved invaluable first to Robert Boyle and later to the Royal Society, whose Curator of Experiments he was from 1662 until his death. In this capacity he 'did most to shape the form of the new Society and to maintain its active existence. . . . It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that he was, historically, the creator of the Royal Society' (p. xx). Hooke was made a Fellow in 1663 and Secretary in 1677. Other honours included his appointment as one of the City of London surveyors for the rebuilding of the capital after the Great Fire, and several important buildings remain to testify to his architectural skill. As a scientist he all but anticipated Newton's theory of gravitation, he is the recognized pioneer of the combustion theory, he invented the spring balance in watches, made improvements in the microscope, telescope, and air-pump, established freezing-point as zero in the thermometric scale, and made various contributions to astronomy and botany.

The Diary covers the years 1672–80, apparently one of the most active periods of Hooke's busy life. The entries take the form of brief daily notes and jottings, sometimes on events of national interest but mainly on his private activities, his visits, his opinions of his acquaintances and colleagues, his labours, his loans and purchases, his meals (the editors have provided a list of the numerous taverns and coffee-houses mentioned by Hooke, and have, where possible, located them), his physical ailments and the strange cures attempted, and his not infrequent Pepysian lapses from the path of virtue. These memo-

¹⁴ *The Diary of Robert Hooke, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., 1672–1680*, transcribed . . . and ed. by Henry W. Robinson and Walter Adams, with a Foreword by Sir Frederick Gowland Hopkins. Taylor and Francis. pp. xxviii + 527. 25s.

randa being designed exclusively for his own use, he has no call to be other than frank in his confessions and economical in his expression. The question of style does not arise, for there is probably not a single 'literary' or grammatically complete sentence in the whole Diary; but for the light which it throws on an interesting personality and his times it is certainly attractive, and the editors, by so competently executing the difficult task of transcription and editing, have performed a valuable service both to scientists and laymen.

Hooke and his Diary are the theme of an appreciative leading article in *T.L.S.* (July 18).

Arthur Bryant has edited a representative selection of Charles II's letters, speeches, and declarations, covering the period c. 1639–84.¹⁵ The years before the Restoration are richest in personal letters; thereafter much of the royal correspondence was conducted by Secretaries of State, and the hand of Charles's ministers is also perceptible in his speeches and declarations. Bryant claims for Charles 'the quality of literary personality' and a high degree of political skill. The editorial links between the selections bridge the occasional gaps and complete the picture of Charles's chequered career.

Students of English and continental thought in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth century will welcome with gratitude Paul Hazard's *La Crise de la Conscience européenne* (1680–1715).¹⁶ Hazard's purpose is to explore the causes, diagnose the symptoms, and follow the progress of the intellectual upheaval which marked the transition from the rule of authority to the rule of reason. His Europe is an intellectual rather than a geographical unit, comprising those peoples united and distinguished by insatiable mental activity, curiosity, and idealism; it is 'une pensée qui ne se contente jamais'. Spinoza, Malebranche, Locke, Leibniz, and Bayle are but a few of its spokesmen discussed by Hazard. It is, indeed, impracticable to indi-

¹⁵ *The Letters, Speeches, and Declarations of King Charles II*, ed. by Arthur Bryant. Cassell. pp. xii+354. 10s. 6d.

¹⁶ *La Crise de la Conscience européenne*, par Paul Hazard. Paris: Boivin. Tomes I and II, 60 fr. pp. viii+326+316. Tome III, 'Notes et Références' (sold separately), 20 fr. pp. 160.

cate adequately here the wide range of his scholarship—to this the volume of 'Notes et Références' is an indisputable testimony—or the variety of the aspects which he chooses to illustrate this intellectual revolution. One can only note, first, his tributes to the important part played by English philosophers, particularly Locke (the significance and influence of whose *Essay* are subtly analysed), the deists and free-thinkers, and, secondly, his stimulating remarks (notably in Part IV: 'Les Valeurs imaginatives et sensibles') on the importance of certain new departures in English literature of this period as viewed against the general European background. Hazard carries his learning easily, and expounds his complex theme with unflagging lucidity and charm.

Two articles which touch upon Hazard's field are Frederick J. E. Woodbridge's *Locke's Essay*,¹⁷ a discussion of the problem of experience and nature as defined by Locke; and, in the same volume, Sterling P. Lamprecht's *The Role of Descartes in Seventeenth-Century England*, where the extent to which Descartes was known to, and influential upon, English writers of 1640-1700 is carefully investigated. The relation of Locke's ideas to those of Descartes is explored at some length.

There remain for notice several miscellaneous articles on the prose of the period. Daniel Gibson, Jnr., in *On the Genesis of 'Pilgrim's Progress'* (*Mod. Phil.*, May), indicates in Bunyan's earlier writings certain situations, characters, and ideas that reappear in *Pilgrim's Progress*. C. M. Webster's *The Satiric Background of the Attack on the Puritans in Swift's 'A Tale of a Tub'* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) presents a bibliography of non-dramatic satires on Puritans from 1621 to 1700. Benjamin Boyce's *A Restoration 'Improvement' of Thomas Dekker* (*M.L.N.*, Nov.) notes that the anonymous prose pamphlet, *Poor Robin's Visions* (1677), is an adaptation of Dekker's *News from Hell*. Clarence D. Thorpe's article, *Two Augustans Cross the Alps: Dennis and Addison on Mountain Scenery* (*S. in Ph.*, July), may be noted here for its account of Dennis's travels in the Alps in 1688. The

¹⁷ In *Studies in the History of Ideas*, ed. by the Department of Philosophy of Columbia University, vol. iii. Columbia Univ. and O.U. Presses.

letter in which Dennis describes his experiences reveals his almost 'romantic' appreciation of the sublimity of mountain scenery. Some aspects of later seventeenth-century pronunciation are touched upon in Arvid Gabrielson's *Elisha Coles's 'Syncrisis'* (1675) as a Source of Information on Seventeenth-Century English (Eng. Stud., April) and in W. Matthews's long and carefully documented study of *Sailors' Pronunciation in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century* (*Anglia*, April).

XI

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

By EDITH J. MORLEY

THE Clarendon Press has issued in the current year several volumes of letters which are outstanding contributions to knowledge of eighteenth-century literature. Of first-rate importance are *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*,¹ edited by David Nichol Smith. These cast new light on the friendship between the two men and form a valuable supplement to Elrington Ball's great edition of Swift's *Correspondence*. In his Introduction Nichol Smith summarizes the history of the fifty-one letters of Swift, now for the first time published in their entirety with the sole exception of one which it has not been possible to trace, but which is described in an 1896 sale-catalogue. The eighteen letters of Ford have been previously printed, and of eight of these the autographs have disappeared, but 'altogether sixty of the letters of Swift and Ford are now printed in this volume from the originals'. The correspondence begins in November 1708 with a letter from Swift and ends with one from Ford, dated 22 November 1737, so that it covers the time of Swift's greatest political activity, and is especially prolific in 1714, the year of the Tory downfall and of his final retirement to Ireland. The dates of the composition (1721–5) and completion of *Gulliver's Travels* (1725) are conclusively proved; the very intimate relationship between the two correspondents is revealed and likewise Swift's part in securing for his friend the editorship of the *London Gazette*, 'the prettiest employment in England of its bigness'. The editor mentions without emphasis that there is 'much that has to be explained' if the reader is to benefit to the utmost by the 'careless intimacy' of the letters. 'Their distinction is that, better than any series of letters to any other friend, they give us Swift in undress. We know him the better for seeing him in undress.' This summary criticism gives the measure of the

¹ *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, ed. by David Nichol Smith. O.U.P. pp. xlvi + 260. 15s.

reader's indebtedness for the way in which the letters are introduced, presented, and annotated, as well as for the publication itself. This contains, in addition to the correspondence, six of Swift's poems which Ford possessed in manuscript, two of them in Swift's autograph: all six differ considerably from the versions hitherto printed. Finally, there is an appendix consisting of letters to Ford from Gay, Pope and Parnell, Bolingbroke and the Duchess of Ormond. No student of the reign of Queen Anne, no reader of Swift, can afford to neglect the volume.

'The present edition contains two hundred and twenty-two letters attributable to Sterne, besides one (No. 18) which bears his signature. Of these, ten are now printed for the first time. . . . Four letters purporting to be his . . . and five from correspondents complete the body of the work. Forty letters in the Appendix, of which nine are hitherto unpublished, relate to Sterne or to . . . his family.' This bare statement of fact, supplemented by a list of omissions of 'dubious' letters, will not conceal from the wary the immense amount of work which must lie behind the new and authoritative edition of *The Letters of Sterne*² by L. P. Curtis, who has devoted ten years to the compilation of his book. The difficulty of collection of the letters is, in the case of Sterne, outweighed by the difficulty of determining what to reject as spurious, and 'a detailed study of these suspicious letters' has resulted in the omission of forty-seven, 'published between 1775 and 1804 and declared by their anonymous editor . . . to be the work of Sterne'. 'It is more likely', according to Curtis, 'that they are forgeries by William Combe'—whose statements are always suspect unless corroborated by external evidence, since, as Fraser told Crabb Robinson (who faithfully recorded the remark in cipher), 'Mr. Combe always lies'. For the same reason, Miss Shaw's *Second Journal to Eliza* (1929) is not even mentioned, though the present writer must confess to have accepted it at its face-value when it was first published. However, Curtis does not ask his readers to accept his estimate of Combe's trustworthiness without giving them

² *Letters of Laurence Sterne*, ed. by Lewis Perry Curtis. O.U.P. pp. xxxiv + 496. 30s.

an opportunity to judge for themselves. He prints three of the letters said to be written by Sterne to Combe, one of which is certainly authentic since it is in Sterne's letter book. A second refers to a supposed dispute about a sermon he is known to have preached; the third (11 June 1765) Curtis thinks 'may be genuine', and includes, except the last paragraph, which he believes to be a forgery. He adds a significant note to one mis-statement of fact: 'There is . . . the possibility that Combe may have fabricated this passage and been ignorant of the date of Mr. Vesey's death.' One may add, judged by the style of the whole, that it is possible the entire letter is a fabrication by Combe.

Nor is Sterne himself above all kinds of petty deceit, instances of which are duly noted by his editor. One of the commonest tricks is to make use of a telling passage in a letter to one correspondent by refurbishing or exactly reproducing it for the delectation of another. Sterne does this even with the most intimate expressions of feeling, and the resulting impression of insincerity is unavoidable. It demands a great deal of enthusiasm for Sterne if we are to believe in 'the ultimate sincerity of his insistence upon spontaneous creation' which, in his editor's opinion, 'can hardly be questioned'.

Of the editor's own enthusiasm there can be no doubt. It is shown not only in the sifting of the letters and in the laborious annotation of the references contained in them, including identification of the persons mentioned or alluded to by dashes and initials, but also in the valuable commentary by which he casts light on the social background of Sterne's life. Curtis applies to his own work the words of Boswell: 'I cannot allow any fragment whatever that floats in my memory concerning the great subject of this work to be lost. . . . Every little spark adds something to the general blaze.' Never did an editor better substantiate such a claim.

The *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*,³ edited by the late Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley, comes as a worthy supplement

³ *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, ed. by the late Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley. O.U.P. 3 vols. (1734-55) pp. lx+454; (1756-65) pp. xxxvi+455-910; (1766-71) pp. xxxiv+911-1360. 63s.

to the chronology of the life and the essay by Roger Martin reviewed in the last volume of *The Year's Work* (pp. 276-8). At long last justice has been done to the poet who has suffered more than most from the shortcomings of his editors, and there is no longer any excuse for misunderstanding or error. Between them, Paget Toynbee and Whibley have collected 130 letters more than were published by Tovey, and of the 500 included in the present edition nearly three-quarters are printed from the original texts. 'A consistent effort has been made to fix the correct dates of the letters. Many dates, hitherto accepted, have been corrected, and many letters not dated before have had their dates determined.' It is not difficult to guess the amount of labour represented by this statement, especially when it is remembered that 'the dates of some sixty letters in all have been altered or more closely defined'. Further: 'Notes are inserted in the text, describing letters known to have been written by Gray at an approximately certain date, of which mention is made in extant letters or in the letters of his correspondents.' The volumes also include 86 letters to Gray from Walpole, Mason, Nicholls, and others; in each volume there is an invaluable Complete List of Letters and Chronological Table; there are numerous illustrations—portraits, facsimiles, and maps—and, in volume three, no fewer than 26 Appendices dealing with various biographical matters, and 7 Genealogical Tables. Throughout, the text is illuminated by full notes 'on the men or things that interested Gray'—a commentary of absorbing interest to the reader—and, finally, the work concludes with five separate indices which run to forty-five pages in all. The editors' work is everything that sound scholarship and discernment can produce.

A complete edition of *The Drapier's Letters*⁴ has been produced by Herbert Davis. The Introduction is divided into three parts, Historical, Bibliographical and Textual, and Collations, which deal exhaustively with these topics. Davis gives convincing reasons for his decision to reprint the five letters from

⁴ *The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland against receiving Wood's Halfpence*, by Jonathan Swift, ed. by Herbert Davis. O.U.P. pp. xcv + 400. 21s.

the Harding text of 1724 with changes only of obvious misprints. 'At the same time all the important variants in the collected editions of 1725, 1730, and 1735 are given at the foot of the page, and all the notes which were added under Swift's supervision in 1735.' Letters vi and vii with *An Account of Wood's Execution* are reprinted from Faulkner's edition of 1735, and four appendices give accounts of *Later Activities of the Drapier*, and descriptive lists of all the prose pamphlets and broadsides concerned with the controversy, of all the verse connected with it, and of the imitations of the *Letters*. In addition the *Letters* are fully annotated and there are reproductions of the Portrait of the Drapier, the Declarations against Wood's Coinage, and the Title-pages of the First Five Letters, printed by John Harding.

The volume thus contains the material necessary for study of the whole controversy and one may legitimately apply to it Swift's own words: 'The work is done and there is no more need of the Drapier.'

In a sumptuous volume, which he entitles *Pope's Own Miscellany*,⁵ Norman Ault reprints a rare book of which only five copies are known to exist and which, as he shows, first appeared on 13 July 1717. Of this volume he proves Pope to have been the editor, and, as the outcome of a detailed and apparently incontrovertible examination, the author of no fewer than thirty-seven anonymous poems contained in it. Ault's arguments cannot be adequately summarized. They are based for the main part on internal evidence of style, mannerisms, phraseology, and the like, but there are also various external reasons for many of his attributions, e.g. references in Pope's correspondence with Henry Cromwell to 'juvenile love-verses' which have not previously been identified, Pope's later acknowledgement of four of the poems, imitations of Cowley and Waller, and of an early version of *Solitude*, &c. Ault's introduction is convincing and must be read by all students of Pope. There seems no doubt that the poems must be added to the canon of the poet's work,

⁵ *Pope's Own Miscellany, being a reprint of Poems on Several Occasions, 1717, containing new poems by Alexander Pope and Others*, ed. by Norman Ault. Nonesuch Press. pp. 98+166. 22s. 6d.

and that though, in *L. Mer.*, October 1924, A. E. Case in some measure anticipated Ault's discovery, this in no way detracts from the value of what has now been for the first time fully substantiated.

Fresh light is cast by the *Miscellany* on Pope and on various of his contemporaries, notably Lady Winchilsea, seven of whose poems are here 'reprinted for the first time', and the Duke of Buckingham whose 'contributions include two pieces . . . which seem never to have been reprinted since 1721'. 'It is to Pope's credit as editor that he gathered together in this collection a far larger proportion of unpublished poems than is usually found in the miscellanies of his day. . . . For the earliest printed texts of some eighty poems of the period, students will henceforth have to consult the pages of *Pope's Own Miscellany*.'

In a letter contributed by Ault to *T.L.S.* on 7 December he supplements his introduction by 'material evidence' respecting Pope's editorship. This consists of the discovery of the autograph of one of Lady Winchilsea's poems with Pope's press corrections in his own writing. Ault also gives further reasons for ascribing the editorship of the so-called *Lintot's Miscellany* to Pope, and a fresh reason for supposing him to be the author of the short version of the poem called *The Old Gentry* which was afterwards re-worked by Prior.

'The story of the failure of *The Rivals*⁶ and its final triumph is a familiar one. Exactly what Sheridan's part in it was, however', has hitherto been a matter of conjecture. By the discovery and publication of the original version of the play as preserved in the Larpent MS., R. L. Purdy has been able to piece out the story. The manuscript, now the property of the Huntington Library, California, is an official copy of the play, prepared for the Lord Chamberlain's licence, and bears the sign-manual of his approval. Subsequently it passed into the hands of Larpent, a later Examiner of Plays, and, together with the manuscripts of several thousand other plays, was, by some unexplained occurrence, put up for sale after his death. About 1832, eight large bundles of these manuscripts were purchased

⁶ *The Rivals*, ed. from the Larpent MS., by Richard Little Purdy. O.U.P. pp. lii+122. 21s.

by Collier, who specifically mentioned *The Rivals* as not being among them. But Purdy says that, in spite of Collier's untrustworthiness, 'there is no ground at all for doubting the genuineness of the manuscript of *The Rivals*', which he had probably overlooked. Subsequently the collection was transferred to Lord Ellesmere's library at Bridgewater House, and thence, in 1917, to the Huntington Library, California.

A comparison between the manuscript and the first published version of *The Rivals* (1775) is facilitated in the volume under review by their reproduction in parallel columns. It is obvious that Sheridan made drastic changes, especially in the character of Sir Lucius O'Trigger, who is transformed from an unscrupulous fortune-hunter into an inoffensive gentleman who could arouse no wrath among Irish patriots. The coarseness of Sir Anthony is also much toned down, the whole of the dialogue is considerably refined, and many of the malapropisms deleted or improved. There are also structural alterations in the play, of which some are important, some only slight. But all the changes show that Sheridan knew how to profit by the attacks of his critics, when these had any justification in fact. He was able to transform the initial failure of the performance on 17 January into a brilliant success, so that when the play was presented for the second time, after a withdrawal of eleven days, it was described as 'performing with universal applause'.

In a chapter on *The Development of the Text*, Purdy calls attention to the fact that the first published edition, besides the above-mentioned changes, also contains 'copious additions' to the manuscript version, and that these 'have, almost without exception, no dramatic significance'. He suggests that these passages probably belonged to the original version, a text that preceded the Larpent MS., and that Sheridan rescued these cancelled lines, most of which occur in the Julia-Faulkland scenes, because he regretted the sacrifice of his rhetoric and sentiment to the exigencies of stage performance. 'The prevailing tone of the additions . . . is elegant, lofty, sententious': the editor believes that they represent Sheridan's own preferences and that it is a mistake to think that the Julia-Faulkland episode was a concession to the sentimental leanings of his audience.

Another point to be noted is that the third edition corrected, of 1777, goes back in many instances to the text of the Larpent MS., and Purdy thinks that it may be the version of the play performed on 28 January 1775. His admirably edited volume adds material of importance to the knowledge of Sheridan's dramatic development.

In an introduction of some twenty pages to *An Essay on the External Use of Water*,⁷ Claude E. Jones seeks to substantiate his opening statement that 'No other English writer leaves to posterity so clear a picture of contemporary medicine as does Tobias George Smollett. . . . Through the fabric of Dr. Smollett's work, the red thread of medicine is apparent in thumb-nail sketches of medical men, in medical observations, in exploits involving medical figures, and in satirical comments on the state of healing at his time.' Jones considers that Smollett is 'extremely important to the student of medical history', chiefly by reason of scattered pictures and comments throughout his novels, but he shows knowledge of contemporary medicine as well as of its practitioners. His *Essay on the External Use of Water* is, however, his most considerable contribution to the science. The text of the present edition is printed from a photostatic copy of an edition in the Surgeon-General's Library.

Garman's edition of *The Fable of the Bees*⁸ consists of a reprint of Part I, omitting the *Essay on Charity and Charity Schools* and the *Vindication*, and of the first *Dialogue* from Part II. It is intended for the use of those who are unable to purchase the standard edition of F. B. Kaye (*The Year's Work*, v. 202-4). In his brief Introduction the present editor relates Mandeville to *The Freethinking Background* of his time, and points out that 'his most solid contribution' to the history of thought 'is the penetrating psychological insight which he applies throughout the *Fable*' while 'The chief literary quality of his book . . . is the realistic, downright style with which his paradoxes are clothed.'

⁷ *An Essay on the External Use of Water*, by Tobias Smollett, ed. by Claude E. Jones. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. \$1.00.

⁸ *The Fable of the Bees*, by Bernard Mandeville, ed. by Douglas Garman. Wishart, 1934. pp. vi + 256. 6s.

John Beresford's single volume of *Passages from Woodforde's Diary of a Country Parson*⁹ will doubtless prove as welcome as the five volumes of selections which were its forerunners. The same competent editor is responsible for the choice of excerpts and he is similarly guided by the desire to make the reader acquainted with 'the ordinary life of ordinary men', to 'convey the day-to-day atmosphere and the continuity of normal life' as shown in the diary between 1758, when it begins, until 1802 when it concludes, about two months before Woodforde's death, on 1 January 1803.

J. G. Bullocke's *Tomlinson Papers*,¹⁰ published for the Navy Records Society, is primarily of naval and historical significance. But the Tomlinsons, father and son, were interesting people with strong religious and political views and their papers, which range in date from 1768 to 1836, reveal a great deal that is of importance to all who wish for intimate knowledge of the eighteenth century. Robert's *Essay on Timber*, for example, is well worth reading, while the letters of both not only transport us into the heart of the time but acquaint us with inside information about naval happenings. They are also written in admirable English by men to whom we are glad to have an introduction, sea-dogs who, as Sir Sidney Smith said of Robert, had all their lives 'dared to dare'.

In the year 1694 Béat Louis de Muralt,¹¹ a young Swiss lately in the French service, decided to 'faire cette chose ordinaire et inutile . . . un tour en Angleterre'. He spent his time exclusively in London but for visits to Sir William Temple, in Surrey, and to the Duke of Somerset at Petworth, and his impressions of the English are derived almost entirely from his knowledge of

⁹ *Woodforde: Passages from the five Volumes of The Diary of a Country Parson*, selected and ed. by John Beresford. O.U.P. pp. xx+534. 10s. 6d.

¹⁰ *The Tomlinson Papers selected from the Correspondence and Pamphlets of Captain Robert Tomlinson, R.N., and Vice-Admiral Nicholas Tomlinson*, ed. by J. G. Bullocke (Navy Records Society). pp. xxx+400. 25s. 6d.

¹¹ *Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et sur les Voyages (1728)*, by B. L. de Muralt, ed. by Charles Gould. Paris: Champion. 1933. pp. 384. 50 frs.

town life. But his letters about his experiences are exceptional in that they for the first time describe English life and social customs in detail, and attempt to estimate the English character with sympathy and understanding. From the literary point of view, the letter which is of most interest is that which deals with the theatre, and especially with English comedy. Muralt's account of the relations between English and French drama shows real acumen and if we need not agree that Ben Jonson errs by lack of moral purpose, that is not to deny the justice of much of his criticism. Even 'English tragedy, he thought, had possibilities', if only the dramatists would 'be simpler in theme and style'. The *Lettres sur les François* and that *sur les Voyages* followed the English letters a few years later and are in a sense complementary to them.

Muralt's work was not published until 1725, and even then against the will of the author, whose pietistic developments led him to under-value these traveller's tales. When he discovered that it was being widely read, he recast and revised the first version, making considerable changes, especially in the French letters, in which he introduced many moral generalizations. 'The 1728 edition is a weighty affair compared with its predecessor.'

It is this edition which Charles Gould reprints, with an introduction in which he gives the author's life and a valuable account of the history of the text and of its contents and influence. The notes are mainly concerned with illustrations of points mentioned in the *Letters* and with contemporary criticisms called forth by the book and its author. The publication, the first in modern times, is welcome from many points of view, and the editor is right in his conclusion that 'With the passing of years [the *Letters*] have lost none of their charm and vitality'.

The diaries of Elizabeth Wynne and her sister, as far as they appear in this volume,¹² are the childish records of experiences in Switzerland and Austria during the troubled years of the French Revolution. But though the writers were in contact with many refugees, whom, as a class they disliked, and though

¹² *The Wynne Diaries*, ed. by Anne Fremantle. Vol. i. 1789–94. O.U.P. pp. xvi+376. 15s.

they described the hopes and fears of the émigrés, on the whole the journals scarcely seem to merit the careful editing and annotation they have received. We are promised three more volumes and it is possible that these will really serve as 'source-book[s] of much interesting material in a period of excitement': it cannot be maintained that this is a description of the present instalment, though it makes pleasant enough desultory reading.

John Yeoman,¹³ a Somersetshire farmer and potter, paid a visit to his aunt at Brentford in the year 1774 and wrote down a description of his London sight-seeing which appears to have been very thorough-going. But many better contemporary accounts are available, and this seems to be another example of a diary which offers little to justify publication. Nor do we think that Yearsley's *Introduction* and *Notes* add very much to its interest.

C. E. Vulliamy has reduced the six tomes of Mrs. Delany's *Autobiography and Correspondence*, edited by Lady Llanover in 1861–2, into a single, very readable volume.¹⁴ The work is well done, but not better, we think, than by R. Brimley Johnson in 1925 (*The Year's Work*, vi. 241–2), so that from one point of view the book is superfluous. But nothing that tends to keep Mrs. Delany in the public eye can be looked upon as a work of supererogation, since she is not merely a typical great lady, but representative of that art of living which was the ideal of her century. There is every reason why she should be remembered as what Burke called her, 'a truly great woman of fashion . . . the woman of fashion of all ages', and also as an individual, brilliant, charming, and, according to her latest panegyrist, able 'to make virtue supremely attractive'. The attraction was as fully recognized by her contemporaries as it must be by all those who are enabled to make her acquaintance in print.

Lester M. Beattie's *John Arbuthnot, Mathematician and Satirist*

¹³ *The Diary of the Visits of John Yeoman to London in the Years 1774 and 1777*, ed. by Macleod Yearsley. Watts, 1934. pp. 55. 5s.

¹⁴ *Aspasia: The Life and Letters of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany (1700–1788)*, by C. E. Vulliamy. Geoffrey Bles. pp. xiv + 290. 10s. 6d.

rist¹⁵ is in the main a critical study of Arbuthnot's work rather than a biography, and it deals in detail with both his satires and his *Works of Sober Intent*, mathematical and medical, adding a chapter on his general characteristics. A large section of the book is devoted to an examination of the John Bull pamphlets and to a discussion of Teerink's theory of Swift's authorship (*The Year's Work*, vi. 220–1), which Beattie denies, basing his ascription of *The History of John Bull* to Arbuthnot on various grounds. He disproves the validity of Teerink's supposed 'parallels of style', and of his interpretation of certain remarks in the *Journal to Stella*, and explains 'the incoherence of *John Bull*' by 'hasty composition'. In Swift's writings, however much he may digress, there is invariably 'positive use of framework' and structural excellence. Even in the *Tale of a Tub* the 'digressions are charted' and differ entirely from 'the haphazard and purely pictorial digressions of *John Bull*. Swift viewed his task as a whole. . . . Arbuthnot . . . did not have a shaping hand for materials in the large. His mind was keenly alive to the next thing, but not to the unity of all things. Hence an organic development in *John Bull* is not to be sought.' In view of what was said in the notice of Teerink's study (*op. cit.*), the present writer should add that she finds Beattie's arguments convincing.

His analysis of Arbuthnot's character and of the nature of his satire is equally the result of minute study of the man and his writings, and the cumulative effect of the book is that it has the authority derived from intimate knowledge of its subject. Arbuthnot 'had a respect for control. Hence there was a steady infusion of thought, even into the most rollicking satire, which . . . in the end amounted to criticism. . . . Intellectual conscience thus saved Arbuthnot's wit from expenditure in frivolity.' 'He was released from any danger of emotional fixity by the variety of his life. . . . He knew the sanative value of a normal existence among men.' 'Arbuthnot's course was not a mere attempt to ignore . . . troubles, but a facing of facts in their relation to the rest of experience, a refusal to mistake some trifling part for the pivotal scene of the drama.'

¹⁵ *John Arbuthnot, Mathematician and Satirist*, by Lester M. Beattie. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xvi + 432. 15s.

Arbuthnot has found no such sympathetic interpretation since Aitken's standard life, and that attempted no comparable discussion of his 'intellectual and literary procedure'.

T.L.S. for 28 Feb. devotes its leading article to a bi-centenary account of *John Arbuthnot, M.D.*, and his efforts 'to assist in the development of a normal society, qualified by clean health to need no satirists, and even no fashionable physicians'.

A. L. Reade, in his preface to *Johnsonian Gleanings*,¹⁶ Part VII, states that it 'is really only a kind of genealogical appendix to Part VI' but that 'its contents are essential to the large scheme' on which he is working. He calls special attention to 'the complicated interactions of kinship' upon Johnson's career and to the novel 'map to illustrate his origins and family associations as well as his life and movements down to 1740'. There is also a very full index of persons and places. If this is not a book to read straight through, it is emphatically one for reference, and it is compiled with meticulous care and industry.

S. C. Roberts has accomplished a difficult task. He has written, in 142 small pages of large print, an account of *Dr. Johnson*¹⁷ which is unhackneyed and independent. Johnson, the man of letters, comes in for as much attention as the personality and the talker, and it is not the least merit of this little book that it insists on Johnson's 'fundamental conviction of the need of authority' in religion, in politics, and in literature. His 'profound reverence for tradition and order' explains most of Johnson's beliefs and prejudices. But the man is made up of more than these and not even Boswell could understand every side of him. 'He was not always the Sage. Fun, as well as wit, flavoured his talk. Boswell is invariably apologetic on this topic.' The Johnson who is endeared to the English-speaking race

'is clearly neither the Lexicographer, nor the Rambler, nor the Tory, but a personality which perhaps no biography, not even Boswell's, can wholly reveal . . . Johnson's friends . . . listened to

¹⁶ *Johnsonian Gleanings. Part VII. The Jervis, Porter, and Other Allied Families*, by Aleyn Lyell Reade. Privately printed for the author by Lund, Humphries. pp. vi + 226. Subscription price: 2*s.*

¹⁷ *Doctor Johnson*, by S. C. Roberts. Duckworth. pp. 142. 2*s.*

him not merely because they enjoyed the readiness of his wit, but because they respected the width of his learning, the clearness of his judgment, and, above all, the fixity of his ethical standards. . . . The exploration of Johnson's mind is still worth making, and the modern seeker after truth will not return from the voyage empty-handed.'

With these words Roberts concludes the study, the whole of which goes to prove their truth.

Stephen Gwynn's life of *Oliver Goldsmith*¹⁸ has the merit of being written with obvious enjoyment and sympathetic understanding. It makes no claim to discover new material or to propound new theories, and it is probably least strong on the critical side. At any rate it would be possible to question Gwynn's off-hand dismissal of Goldsmith's claim to the possession of penetrating critical faculty. To give only two examples: when he wrote it was no small matter to object to 'disgusting solemnity of manner', nor to discover that Llyl's style is 'a kind of prodigy of neatness, clearness, and precision'. Nor, as we think, is Goldsmith's contribution to drama, to verse, and to the essay given sufficient weight, though here the author errs, if at all, by under-statement or inadequate treatment—not by what he says but by what he omits. Yet he writes a biography which is full of charm and interest, and in which his admiration for Goldsmith is shown to be founded on knowledge, of what he calls 'the essential man'. One could wish that it had not been felt necessary to labour quite so often the contrast between Johnson and Goldsmith: it is true that they differed in outlook, in character, and in achievement. But Gwynn himself quotes Johnson's dictum that 'whether we take [Goldsmith] as poet—as a comick writer—or as an historian, he stands in the first class'; he also tells us that 'admiration and affection always had the better' of resentment in Goldsmith's attitude towards Johnson. The two men differed in many particulars but fundamentally they respected as well as loved one another—and none the less because each preserved his independence of mind. A man so sensitive and so *gauche* in society as Goldsmith was

¹⁸ *Oliver Goldsmith*, by Stephen Gwynn. Thornton Butterworth. pp. 288. 15s.

bound often to suffer from Johnson's overbearing manners, far more, probably, than Johnson himself would have conceived possible. Boswell has over-emphasized that aspect of their intercourse. There was no need to lay fresh stress upon it. This account of Goldsmith in its freshness and penetration is notwithstanding perhaps the most attractive that has yet appeared.

R. W. Ketton Cremer's small life of *Thomas Gray*¹⁹ suffices to prove the writer's understanding of his subject. Gray is interpreted with sympathy, and the legend that 'he never spoke out' is disproved by reference to both his poetry and his letters. Ketton Cremer had not the advantage of access to Martin's researches on Gray (*The Year's Work*, xv. 276-8) or to the new edition of the letters described above (see pp. 284-5) in time to profit adequately by the fresh material to be found in them, but while for the most part he deals with no new facts, he treats what was known freshly and with the obvious desire to arrive at a true interpretation of the man and the poet. His book takes precedence as the most trustworthy introduction to Gray in the language.

S. Shellabarger's *Lord Chesterfield*²⁰ is an attempt to portray the author of the *Letters* as a perfect exponent of worldliness; a 'representative of the worldly tradition at its best', the man is shown in relation to his philosophy of life and also to the letters which have become its 'monumental expression'. Shellabarger claims that Chesterfield's life has never before been depicted from this angle, which, nevertheless, alone permits it to be seen in the proper focus. 'Therefore', the introduction concludes, the present work seeks 'first of all to know more of Chesterfield, the individual, the wit, politician, and pedagogue of the eighteenth century, but in him we shall also study, under the most favourable light, during its most illustrious period, a certain imperishable human type. . . . At times we shall be

¹⁹ *Thomas Gray*, by R. W. Ketton Cremer. Duckworth. pp. 136.
2s.

²⁰ *Lord Chesterfield*, by Samuel Shellabarger. Macmillan. pp. xiv + 422. 15s.

led to inquire concerning the wisdom of Chesterfield and his school, whether it is really wise.'

It may be at once conceded that the author has succeeded in his endeavour. His portrait of Chesterfield is convincing. If it does not present a noble character, it shows a man no worse, and in many respects more likeable, because more honest and more consistent than his neighbours. Chesterfield preached what he practised and what his world practised: nor are his worldly maxims out of date. Spiritual experience, idealism, irrational faith—with such things he was not concerned, and of their virtue he had no conception. His reputation has suffered from his frank and forceful acceptance of a code which exalts manners above morals, and immediate social success above lasting truth. He has become the scapegoat of 'the universal system of worldly standards and values . . . because he dared to voice its tenets clearly instead of bowdlerizing them'.

It is fair to emphasize this aspect of Shellabarger's study, for to it he returns again and again. But it would convey a wrong impression were we to do so at the expense of the detailed examination of Chesterfield's career and political activities, and above all of the section which deals with Philip Stanhope and the *Letters*. In his treatment of the latter Shellabarger is at his best, and he uses the variations of tone and style in masterly fashion as an indication that after all Chesterfield's 'silly, rational pose of paternal affection dependent on filial merit' does not completely succeed in concealing 'the somewhat pathetic glimpse of a fond solicitous human heart'. 'The parent of these closing letters . . . has suddenly grown much older, much softer'—and so he was to prove himself in the final shock of his son's death and the discovery of his secret marriage. The book has an adequate, though professedly incomplete, bibliography and a satisfactory index.

In her biography of *William Shenstone*²¹ Marjorie Williams succeeds in conveying to her readers something of the charm which she finds in the man and his writings, and this without overstatement or exaggeration of his achievement. For the

²¹ *William Shenstone: A Chapter in Eighteenth-Century Taste*, by Marjorie Williams. Birmingham: Cornish. pp. 152. 6s.

first time a successful attempt is made in this little book to see Shenstone in his environment and to portray his manifold interests in people, in literature, and in things, while showing him in relation to the age in which he lived. Miss Williams emphasizes the importance of his letters which 'record the passing moods of an eighteenth-century man of taste. . . . Yet the matter—friendship, virtue, the joys of country life, the latest addition to the ferme ornée, the unsatisfactory life in cities—is of less importance than the manner . . . and few have crystallized the vivid impression of the moment more truly than William Shenstone.' 'Undoubtedly his reputation should be built up anew upon his *Letters*', which are here 'accounted among the best which the eighteenth century produced.' But his critical essays, his *Men and Manners*, and his prose writings generally merit much more praise than has usually been given to them, while some of his nature-poetry possesses a lyrical grace and sounds a personal note unusual in the verse of his contemporaries. As he wrote in his *Essay on Elegy*, if he 'describes a rural landskip, or unfolds the train of sentiments it inspired, he fairly drew his picture from the spot, and felt very sensibly the affection he communicates'—no small merits at a date when poets have been accused of not writing with their eye on the object.

Gilbert Thomas, in his life of Cowper,²² is mainly concerned to portray him in relation to his time and, more particularly, to the Evangelical Revival. In this attempt he arrives at conclusions which are likely to surprise those who are less ardent supporters of that movement, as, for instance, that 'Blake gave the most vital imaginative expression to the spirit behind the Revival'; or that while Cowper's 'early association with Calvinism must be lamented' because it 'fostered dangerous habits of introspection', 'in Methodism . . . he found the most joyful and vital influence of his life', or that under Newton's influence 'Cowper's own well-established Calvinism diminished rather than increased'. But unfortunately Cowper relied too much on his reason and did not sufficiently trust his heart: had he been less

²² *William Cowper and the Eighteenth Century*, by Gilbert Thomas. Ivor Nicholson. pp. 395. 15s.

rationalistic or had he 'known some good Arminian friend' in his London days, his recurring 'fits of morbidity' might have been avoided. 'At all events, after he definitely embraced Evangelicalism, his madness returned only at long intervals. . . . It is irrelevant to cite the comparatively settled gloom of his declining years.' There was no connexion between his insanity and his religious creed. With equal skill, Thomas proves the 'comparative mildness' of Newton's Calvinism; his expressions of its more violent sentiments 'represent merely the *formal* voice, not of Newton alone, but of his age'. It may fairly be objected that the six 'rabid sentiments' quoted by Mr. Fausset as 'not exceptional' in Newton's writings would seem to overstep the bounds of mere formality. The reader may judge from the first of the two used by Thomas to illustrate his point: 'We find depravity so deep-rooted in our nature, that, like the leprous house, the whole fabric must be taken down before we can be freed from its defilement.'

In short, this book, with all its merit, is a piece of special pleading which is not likely to convince any but the converted that Cowper's 'merely habitual use of Calvinistic terminology' is less the expression than the resolution of his mental agony. Most readers will continue to feel that *The Castaway* sounds a note of despairing anguish and shows no sign 'that in the depths of Cowper there was peace'.

No voice divine the storm allay'd,
 No light propitious shone
 When, snatch'd from all effectual aid,
 We perish'd, each alone:
 But I beneath a rougher sea,
 And whelm'd in deeper gulphs than he.

This is the authentic note of despair—not 'an antidote to religious depression'.

As Arthur Skemp Memorial Lecturer at the University of Bristol, Edmund Blunden took as his subject *Edward Gibbon and his Age*²³ with the intention 'to find him in his devotional character and to suggest that . . . his lay sermon has become the

²³ *Edward Gibbon and his Age*, by Edmund Blunden. Bristol: Arrow-smith. pp. 38. 1s. 6d.

voice of our time'. On the way to this conclusion, Gibbon is shown in his place among the 'Quarto Historians' of his age, and, in his autobiography, disclosing what Blunden calls his 'workaday gospel', his 'broad theory of life and conduct'.

In his *George Colman the Elder*,²⁴ Eugene R. Page has completed a very useful task and thrown a good deal of light upon the history of the theatre during the years 1760–90 at the same time as he has written an account of the life and work of Colman in all its aspects. As a result it is shown that his is a much more important figure than has hitherto been supposed. The nephew and ward of Pulteney, afterwards earl of Bath, Colman was educated at Westminster and Christ Church and later at Lincoln's Inn, where he was called to the Bar. But he gave up both his legal career and his prospects of inheriting his uncle's fortune in order to devote himself to the theatre, and it is mainly to his work as manager and as dramatist that he owes his place in literature, though he proved his competence as an essayist and as editor of *The Connoisseur* while he was still an undergraduate, and continued to contribute to periodical literature, notably in 1775 in the series of six essays entitled *The Gentleman*, at intervals throughout his life. In an appendix, Page gives a list of *All Acted Plays Written or Altered by George Colman*, and the number and character of these show the influence he exerted in the revival of the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, as well as the fact of his authorship of such comedies as *The Jealous Wife*, and of his collaboration (with Garrick) in such plays as *The Clandestine Marriage*. But it was above all as manager that he contributed most to the history of the theatre, not merely by producing both *The Good Natur'd Man* in 1768 and *She Stoops to Conquer* in 1773, but by his whole conduct of the war of the theatres and by the plays he staged and the actors and actresses he discovered and employed.

In the words of Page's epilogue:

'A tendency to let one or two figures represent a period has

²⁴ *George Colman the Elder, Essayist, Dramatist, and Theatrical Manager, 1732–1794*, by Eugene R. Page. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xii+334. 15s.

obscured our record of men like Colman, who, in their own day, were of real importance to literature. For an appreciation of the life of the times, a biography of such a man as Colman may in many ways present a better picture than the history of one great enough to loom above his age. . . . Colman . . . participated in all the varieties of literary and social activity of his day. His career at school, at college, as a nobleman's protégé, as essayist, pamphleteer, hack, poet, translator, dramatist, manager; his friendships, his quarrels, his plans, his schemes, and his failures, are in a great many ways typical of his time. Through that busy and intimate social and literary world moved not only Colman and men of his rank, but such men as Johnson, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Garrick, Wilkes, Churchill, Gray. . . . In that incomparable fellowship of the Club, "little Coley" was an active and ambitious participant, certainly not unworthy of the company he kept.'

So to have presented him, without any loss of proportion, is to have made a contribution to the knowledge of the eighteenth century for which the writer deserves the thanks of his fellow students.

Paul Staubert's study of Chatterton²⁵ is psychological, not literary, in its scope. The writer summarizes his purpose in the following sentences which sufficiently indicate his method:

'Zweck der vorliegenden Arbeit war es, . . . die Erscheinungsformen des Lebens und Dichtens Chattertons auf die normalen psychischen Grundlagen des Jugendalters zurückzuführen. . . . Wir haben die Zeit der Pubertät als eine gestaltungsreiche Epoche des menschlichen Lebens erkannt, haben die Genese der Traumwelt und die Gestaltung der Rowley-Dichtung auf primitive psychische Grundlagen zurückgeführt. Die so seltsamen äusseren Formen der Chatterton-Dichtung, vor allem die Rowley-Sprache, haben wir von diesem Gesichtspunkt aus betrachtet. Die "Fälschung" wurde uns auf Grund der jugendlichen Psyche verständlicher. . . . Durch eine solche Betrachtungsweise glauben wir . . . zum weiteren Verständnis der Rowley-Dichtung beigetragen zu haben.'

Charlotte Ramsay Lennox is dismissed by Professor Elton in a couple of brief paragraphs which conclude with a quotation from Mrs. Barbauld to the effect that her chief novel, *The*

²⁵ *Thomas Chatterton und seine Rowley-Dichtung untersucht auf Grund der Psychologie der Reifezeit*, by Paul Staubert. (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie. vol. xxiv.) pp. 162. M. 6.60.

Female Quixote, is no longer of interest, since the satire is out of date. Nor is this unfair treatment if she is to be judged by the intrinsic worth of her writings. Indeed, Miriam Rossiter Small²⁶ claims no more for the best of them than that 'As a burlesque *The Female Quixote* is successful' and that it would be most liked by a contemporary who had at some time 'buried himself in the romances', while on the lesser examples of her art the verdict is passed that: 'She possesses little originality. . . . The parts which have freshness to-day are a few characters . . . and the Colonial scenes drawn from Mrs. Lennox's childhood experience.'

Yet it would be a mistake to think that Miss Small's careful account of the life and writings of Mrs. Lennox is of merely academic interest. The work is well done and in such a way as to cast considerable light on contemporary literature and society. Above all it illustrates the difficulties and courage of a woman who had to live by her pen and contrived to do so in spite of the propriety of her conduct. Mrs. Lennox was not popular with the blue-stockings, nor was she given the entry to fashionable society. But though Johnson thought her 'superior . . . to . . . all' the most admired contemporary *savantes*, and though she was intimate with many of the foremost men of the time, no breath of scandal ever touched her. Whatever may nowadays be thought of her 'genius', in this respect, living as she did from 1720 to 1804 and unhappily married as she was, she must surely be unique among eighteenth-century professional women-of-letters.

'This slight essay²⁷ makes no pretensions to original research; it is . . . pieced together from printed sources.' But Scott has written a readable account of Day which presents 'a philosopher in search of the life of virtue and of a paragon among women'. No other full-dress biography of Day is readily available, and the eccentric author of *Sandford and Merton* certainly merits to

²⁶ Charlotte Ramsay Lennox: an Eighteenth-Century Lady of Letters, by Miriam Rossiter Small. Yale Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. viii + 268.
11s. 6d.

²⁷ The Exemplary Mr. Day, 1748–1789, by Sir S. H. Scott. Faber and Faber. pp. 179. 8s. 6d.

be better-known to his fellow countrymen. We could wish, however, that Scott had found it possible to avoid having his 'little laugh at Day', his tilts at suffragettes and his generalizations about women. He writes best when he takes no superfluous trouble to entertain, and in truth his subject requires no extraneous efforts to amuse. Day's extravagant views and his attempts to live up to them need no embellishment.

In *Who's Who in Boswell?*²⁸ J. L. Smith-Dampier 'seeks . . . to quicken interest in Boswell's great book, by making the characters live more fully before the readers' eyes'. He attempts to do this by dividing a leap-year into days, and devoting one date to each person mentioned, Johnson himself being allowed the first twenty days in January, five days of 'Varia', 21 to 25 November, and a page for 'Leave Taking' under 30 December. 31 December, 'Retrospective', consists of expressions of gratitude for help given to the compiler, while Boswell and his family, other biographies of Johnson and 'Writers on Johnson', occupy the dates 21 to 28 February inclusive. With these exceptions, a single page (and date) is devoted to each person mentioned, be he important or unimportant, and since the names occur in alphabetical order, the use of dates appears to serve no purpose. The arrangement necessarily causes disproportion, for some of the characters obviously merit fuller treatment than others. Moreover, Smith-Dampier's composition of his sentences and paragraphs is frequently at fault, and *anacolutha* are of constant occurrence. Because of its errors in arrangement and statement, the book is likely to gain less gratitude than it deserves for the industry that has been expended on the accumulation of facts. Nor do we gain the impression that Smith-Dampier has been more successful than Boswell in imparting life to the characters introduced by the biographer.

Hans Reimers, in his essay on *Jonathan Swift*,²⁹ attempts to reconcile the discrepancies which he finds between Swift's eso-

²⁸ *Who's Who in Boswell?* by J. L. Smith-Dampier. Blackwell. pp. xx+366. 10s. 6d.

²⁹ *Jonathan Swift: Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche*, by Hans Reimers. Britannica, vol. 9. Univ. of Hamburg and Fried- richsen, de Gruyter. pp. 194. 1934. RM. 8.50.

teric and exoteric opinions on the subjects of Church and religion. This dualism he connects with the 'Tendenzen der Aufklärung'. Swift is not to be judged by his literary pronouncements alone, for these do not represent the inner conflict which is more clearly exhibited in his letters, especially those to Pope and Bolingbroke. His avowed rationalism here gives place to an 'innere Überzeugung' that reason is an imperfect guide: feeling insists on breaking in. 'Deshalb sind auch die irrationalen Gegenströmungen im Seelenleben Swifts unverkennbar, obgleich er sich bemüht, sie zu verdecken.' The proof-reading leaves much to be desired and the essay is full of printers' errors.

In 1930 Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach founded at the University of Pennsylvania a Fellowship in Bibliography of which Shane Leslie was the holder in 1933–4. The volume entitled *The Script of Jonathan Swift*³⁰ contains the three lectures which he delivered in this capacity. The book is named after the first lecture; the others, which do not come within the scope of this section, deal respectively with *The Rarest Irish Books* and with *Saint Patrick's Purgatory*. Twenty-seven pages of notes supplement the lectures, and there are also five illustrations, three of Swift's handwriting, one of Stella's, and one of Rebecca Dingley's.

In the lecture on Swift's script, Leslie denies the authenticity of the so-called 'disguised handwriting' and maintains that except for variations in size and in speed, it is uniform throughout his life. His autograph is established, and so at last is also that of Stella and of Mrs. Dingley. The other main point of the lecture is the bearing of Swift's handwriting on the identification of his poems which are 'the worst edited of any poet, major or minor, in English literature', but are on the way to lose that bad pre-eminence since Mr. Harold Williams is engaged in the preparation of a reliable text. 'Of the bulk of Swiftian verse Mr. Williams has come to the conclusion that 262 poems are genuine and 138 attributions are doubtful, demonstrably unjustifiable, or written by another hand.' Earlier editors, including Elrington Ball, 'have too often included the doubtful with

³⁰ *The Script of Jonathan Swift and Other Essays*, by Shane Leslie. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press and O.U.P. pp. 98. 7s. 6d.

the genuine', and Faulkner's collection of 1735 still holds the field; Leslie has been so happy as to discover the copy of this sent to Swift by the publishers and containing his marginal corrections.

The first volume of 'Swiss Studies in English' consists of an account by Rudolf Stamm of *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes*³¹ which starts from the assumption that since Defoe lived at a period of intellectual upheaval, it was natural that he 'should deceive himself as well as his public in an attempt to avoid unpalatable truth'. Defoe was a Puritan by conviction, but he was influenced by the 'Aufklärung'. 'Er spielte vor sich und der Welt die Rolle des religiösen Menschen, weil er—trotz seiner Modernität—noch das Bedürfnis nach dem absoluten Halt empfand.' But the new desire for liberty of thought and action disturbed his Puritan faith in indubitable tenets and he was torn between the comfort to be derived from the old creed and the new yearning for free investigation in every direction, religious, ethical, political, economic, and aesthetic.

Stamm attempts to determine 'wieviel vom religiösen Gehalt des Puritanertums in Defoe noch lebendig war, wieviel und was für anders geartete Anschauungen in ihn eindrangen, was für Kompromisse er schloss, sei es zufolge einer besonderen natürlichen Anlage oder als Glied seiner Generation.' His study, carefully documented and illustrated by quotations, makes for the better understanding of the 'elusiveness' of Defoe.

Heinz Ronte's analysis of the history of the reputations of Richardson and Fielding³² is based on considerations wholly unfamiliar to English scholars. The first chapter, entitled 'Geschichte und Stand', separates the two men in the following strange paragraph: 'Die Ruhmesgeschichte von Richardson und Fielding trägt in sich das Zeichen von Bibel und Mythos. Ausdruck hierfür ist das Standestum der Ruhmsprecher. In ihnen verkörpern und verwirklichen sich die beiden treibenden

³¹ *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes*, by Rudolf Stamm. *Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiter I.* Zürich: Niehan. pp. 344.

³² *Richardson und Fielding; Geschichte ihres Ruhms: Literärsoziologischer Versuch*, by Heinz Ronte. (*Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten*, 25. Band.) Leipzig: Tauchnitz. pp. 218.

Weltkräfte. Christliches Bibeltum offenbart sich in dem Standestum der Ruhmsprecher Richardsons, heidnisches Welttum offenbart sich in dem Standestum der Ruhmsprecher Fieldings.³² Their literary art and the history of their reputation are examined from this point of view; we learn, for example, of 'Spruch für Richardson und gegen Fielding unter christlich-geistlichem Einfluss', of 'Adeliger Ruhmspruch für Fielding' and so forth. Presumably the argument is clear to those who understand the contemporary German 'Weltanschauung': to others it will be incomprehensible.

Eugène Joliat, in noting the revived popularity of Smollett in recent years, points out that his supposed lack of influence in France has been assumed without adequate examination of the facts. In *Smollett et la France*³³ he makes good this deficiency, treating in the first part of his work French influence on the novelist's early writings, and proceeding thence to his relations with France and his opinions of the French nation. Finally, he discusses the reception of Smollett's work in France in his own day and subsequently, showing in detail why the picaresque method of Smollett could not be popular in a country where literary ideals differed so profoundly from his. Smollett's type of humour, the absence of love-interest in his novels, his brutality, his insular nationalism, his whole mentality, were antagonistic to the French genius. Thus, though Smollett's work was known and translated into French, it was less appreciated and less influential than that of any one of his great contemporaries, Fielding, Richardson, and Sterne.

Joliat's investigation is conducted with the thoroughness and skill we have been taught to expect in French works of comparative criticism, and he justifies the claim made at the outset of his task:

'À l'occasion de Smollett et pour ainsi dire à travers lui, nous abordons des problèmes plus larges, plus généraux. D'abord, en montrant ce que celui-ci doit à Lesage, nous étudions une des phases les plus importantes de l'histoire du roman de mœurs et d'aventures. Les idées de Smollett sur la France sont à peu près celles de la plupart des Anglais de son temps. . . . L'étude de la

³² *Smollett et la France*, by Eugène Joliat. Paris: Champion. pp. 280.

fortune littéraire de Smollett en France permet de constater les différences fondamentales qui ont existé entre le goût anglais et le goût français.'

It was well worth while to complete the undertaking conceived in such a spirit.

When dealing with a book entitled *Blake and Milton*,³⁴ the impulse to turn first to the index to look for the entries under Blake's *Milton* seemed not unnatural. But the desire could not be gratified, for Saurat's book contains no index, nor did an examination of the text reveal any adequate exposition of the work so entitled, nor indeed of any of Blake's prophetic books. Yet a critic as enlightened as Laurence Binyon claims that 'it is through what are called the *Prophetic Writings* that Blake's full message was given to the world', and, rightly or wrongly, Blake himself believed that his greatest poetry was contained in them. Saurat's omission is, thus, a serious matter, so serious indeed, that for the present writer it vitiates his whole treatment of his subject. Blake's theories, he says, 'were built in a ramshackle manner upon intuitions and visions: but this is not always an inferiority, and sometimes . . . the less logical thinker is the more profound'. It seems clear, then, that the theories cannot be grasped without reference to the 'intuitions and visions', and that no very useful purpose is served by a comparison merely between the logical thought of the one man and the unmethodical statements of the other. Saurat does not appear to penetrate beneath the surface in a treatment of Blake which disregards what is most essential and vital in his genius—the imaginative insight which to him signifies so much more than understanding.

The title *Jewish Characters in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction and Drama*³⁵ sufficiently indicates the scope of H. R. S. van der Veen's careful treatise, in which he deals with an aspect of the subject that has hitherto been neglected. The result of

³⁴ *Blake and Milton*, by Denis Saurat. Stanley Nott. pp. 160.
58.

³⁵ *Jewish Characters in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction and Drama*, by H. R. S. van der Veen. Groningen: Wolters. pp. 308. Gld. 4.90.

his investigation is to show that not much of consequence is discoverable in the literary treatment of the Jew at this period. With rare exceptions, though he is frequently introduced, it is as a stock figure of caricature, which betrays little or no first-hand knowledge on the part of the writer. Smollett is almost alone in portraying (in his *Count Fathom*) a 'benevolent Hebrew' who is meant to be attractive. Van der Veen has also succeeded in unearthing at the Huntington Library the lost play called *The Israelites or the Pampered Nabob*, which likewise treats the Jew as 'an ordinary human being' and neither as a buffoon nor as a monster. The play has traditionally been ascribed to Smollett, but, as is here shown, without good cause.

'A study of the sublime . . . comes very near being a study of English thought and arts, for we find the idea applied to rhetoric, to literature, to painting, to sculpture, to music, to biblical criticism, and to natural scenery ; and it has its roots in the psychology and the philosophy of the times. . . . I have attempted to find as many theories of sublimity as possible, and to summarize them clearly and truthfully, relating them incidentally to contemporary movements in literature . . . painting and . . . natural scenery ; and to view all these theories as an important link in the chain of ideas that . . . connects organically the literature of the Augustan age with that of the age of Wordsworth.'

In these words, Samuel H. Monk describes the scope of his book on *The Sublime*³⁶ which begins with a chapter on 'Longinus and the Longinian Tradition in England' and another on 'Boileau and Silvain' before proceeding to deal with English criticism. The study concludes with a bibliography of ten pages which does not include 'miscellaneous titles referred to only in passing'. The author has done his work with intelligence as well as industry : he concludes modestly that 'As a general interpretation of the eighteenth century this study probably has nothing new to offer, but it has sought to show from its own point of view the slow and unconscious growth of English art away from the orderly garden of the Augustan age to the open fields (the jungle, if you will) of the romantic period'. Many of Monk's

³⁶ *The Sublime: a Study of Critical Theories in 18th Century England*, by Samuel H. Monk. New York: M.L.A. and O.U.P. pp. viii+252. 11s. 6d.

readers, probably most of them, will find a great deal of fresh material to help them to an understanding of the age.

In *Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry*³⁷ C. V. Deane lays 'particular emphasis . . . on the need for discriminating between a lifeless and an imaginative use of conventional poetic language, and between a pictorial and a poetic sense of design', in order to show the virtue rather than the weakness of the nature-verse of the age. Quite properly, he prefers to examine in detail the work of certain selected poets who appeal to him personally—Pope, Ambrose and John Philips, and Shenstone—rather than to concern himself 'unduly with poems that belong to literary history rather than to literature'. In this, incidentally, he agrees with Shenstone who wrote that 'it is idle to be assiduous in the perusal of inferior poetry'. Deane begins his study by a brief comparison of eighteenth-century poetic diction with earlier conventions, and then proceeds to an examination of 'Theories of Generalized Form and Diction' in criticism, and of the supposed influence of landscape art on 'Principles of Visual Composition in eighteenth-century poetry'. He makes the valuable point that the poet has a greater freedom of selection than the painter and also 'complete control over the order in which the objects are presented'. A good descriptive poet knows how to select in such a way as to 'convey the atmosphere of the scene', and passages from Cowper and from Thomson are cited to illustrate the different effects attained by such choice of objects, and to show 'that the "precise suggestion of a visible whole" . . . is contrived by methods of composition and grouping analogous to, and often identical in aim, with those of landscape painting, but purely poetic in substance and execution'. Good descriptive poetry, even when it employs conventional images and uses conventional diction, adds 'concealed or subordinated particularity' which imparts life and originality to the effect attained. In a masterly analysis of Pope's *Pastorals*, Deane shows 'the unforced pervasiveness of their landscape setting', and Part Three of his essay illustrates his sensitive and wise appraisal of the poets with whom he

³⁷ *Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry*, by C. V. Deane. Blackwell. pp. 145. 7s. 6d.

deals. His exposition is a genuine contribution to the better understanding of eighteenth-century nature-poetry and of its underlying principles, and is an example of criticism that is original and forceful without any appearance of self-assertion. The lack of an index is a serious defect in a book which should be available for reference.

In *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry*³⁸ Dwight L. Durling examines the descriptive nature-poetry of the eighteenth century from an angle somewhat different from that of his predecessors. As his title implies, Durling is concerned with the influence and imitation of Virgil's *Georgics*, 'that best poem of the best poet', 'the most complete, elaborate, and finish'd piece of all antiquity', as Dryden and Addison considered it. *Cyder*, by John Philips, 1706, is cited as the poem 'which fixed the English georgic as a type and determined its form', 'ingeniously adapting the themes of an admired original into terms of native conditions'. Thomson's *Seasons* is, however, the chief example of the 'descriptive-didactic tendency', and a chapter is devoted to an examination of its relation to Virgil and to its general characteristics and influence. There follow sections on the 'Poetry of Country Occupations', 'The Muse of Utility', 'Days and Season', 'A Note on Local Verse', and a Conclusion which summarizes the whole book as 'The story . . . of the origin and growth in England of a georgic tradition in poetry, of its various mutations and of the complementary, indeed inseparable, growth of the descriptive form introduced by Thomson, an offspring of the georgic'. Nothing need be added to this account of its contents.

In *Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century*,³⁹ F. C. Green attempts to investigate the reciprocal influence of the two countries on drama, poetry, and the novel. The comparison is made by a student of the literatures who speaks with detailed first-hand knowledge

³⁸ *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry*, by Dwight L. Durling. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xii+260. 15s.

³⁹ *Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century*, by F. C. Green. Dent. pp. 490. 15s.

of both, and he succeeds in proving that the supposed interaction of ideas has been exaggerated, and that, as he puts it in his concluding paragraph, 'In examining the writings of two divergent races, with regard to questions of resemblance or influence, it is fatally easy to lose one's sense of perspective.' Thus he has little difficulty in showing, for example, that too much has been made by enthusiastic inquirers of the presumed effect of Shakespeare's influence on the work of Voltaire, and that ignorance of French conceptions of tragedy has been responsible for an exaggeration of the significance of supposed likenesses between unlike things. No real contact was possible 'between the slow, cumulative, experimental method of the English dramatist and the concentrated, tense, swift manner of French tragedy'. Similarly in poetry, 'Thomson, Young, and Macpherson were never really assimilated by the eighteenth-century French writers. Only in so far as they already had something in common with French taste were they imitated. What was essentially English vanished in the process. . . . The invasion of literature by sensibility . . . proceeded almost wholly from French sources.' As a final illustration we may cite Green's dictum about Diderot and Richardson, that 'in everything that concerns the art of the novel, these two writers live in different worlds'.

These somewhat haphazard instances of Green's conclusions are necessarily inadequate to show the steps by which they are reached. Nor can they reproduce the arguments and the quotations by which they are supported, nor give a fair impression of the scope of the book. Nevertheless they serve to represent the main thesis, which is that the 'pursuit of "parallels" and "sources" often leads the keen research scholar to neglect the substance for the shadow, and thus to forget what a priceless illumination may be obtained from the comparative study of artists who resemble each other in nothing but the fact that each has endeavoured to express . . . the traditional spirit of his race and of his time'.

The contention may be taken as proved and the writer of *Minuet* convinces his reader that he is competent to deal with the ramifications of his difficult subject. We think, nevertheless, that he is too obsessed by the errors of his predecessors, and

that his book suffers by what the writer of the blurb acclaims as his 'wit, freshness, and grace', but what mature readers are more likely to condemn as lapses in taste and judgement.

'*The Catalogue of the Collection of Prints of Political and Personal Satire* in the British Museum was begun by Mr. Frederic George Stephens' and comprised five volumes 'covering events of the years 1320 to 1770.' M. D. George⁴⁰ takes up the work where he dropped it in 1883; the present volume covers the years of the American Revolution and it is intended that she shall continue her task up to the Reform Bill of 1832. That she is performing it with the care and competence to be expected from the author of *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* is indicated by the facts that the volume here noticed has required five years for its compilation, and that the description of some 1,500 prints occupies 785 octavo pages. This is not the place for a detailed account of her achievement, which nevertheless requires mention in *The Year's Work*, because, as Mrs. George puts it in her Introduction, the political prints 'chronologically arranged . . . show in a remarkable way the *tempo* of political life, the fluctuations and interaction of opinion and propaganda. There is scarcely a political or diplomatic question which they do not illustrate, often from an unaccustomed angle,' while, 'Taken together, the sequence of political and social prints reflects, as nothing else does, the changing and elusive spirit of the period.' Ridicule of the Frenchman, the Scot, Irishman, and Welshman, of the 'cit', of life and manners in general, of extravagance in dress and changing fashions in particular, and of the 'passion for personal scandal and the ruthlessness with which it was exploited', these and many other themes are favourite subjects of the caricaturists, and 'in a period when political and social life were inextricably mixed, when politics were personal and social to an extreme degree . . . the line between political and personal satires is naturally vague and fluctuating'.

⁴⁰ *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vol. v, 1771-1783, by Mary Dorothy George. Printed by Order of the Trustees. pp. xlii+852. £2 2s.

The book may be recommended as equally attractive to students of the eighteenth century whether their chief preoccupation be with literary, social, or political history, or with the development of satiric art.

Frederic Ewen's *Bibliography of Eighteenth-Century English Literature*⁴¹ continues the very useful series of Columbia University bibliographies which, intended primarily for undergraduates, should be of value to students of all ages. It is subdivided under the main headings 'Background', 'Literary History', 'Aesthetics and Literary History', 'The Age of Pope', 'The Age of Johnson', 'Literary Currents, Tendencies, and Attitudes', and, with various subdivisions and a Subject Index, appears to contain references to most of the important texts and critical works which will be required by any but specialists.

The chief contributions to the current *Burns Chronicle*⁴² are *Letters of and Concerning Robert Burns*, four of which are printed for the first time; and the second instalment of the *Correspondence of John Syme and Alexander Cunningham*, consisting of ten letters, of which only one has hitherto appeared and that 'through a gross breach of faith'. The letters include details of the poet's last illness and death. There are also articles on 'Burns's Last Years' by Franklyn B. Snyder, in which he offers evidence to show that the poet was not an habitual drunkard; by John McVie, on 'The Lochlie Litigation and the Sequestration of William Burns'; and by Davidson Cook and J. C. E. on 'Louisa Fontenelle, actress'.

Essays by Divers Hands (R.S.L., vol. xiv), as noted above, p. 25, contains a contribution by D. Nichol Smith entitled 'Jonathan Swift: Some Observations'. This begins with the characteristic remark that the writer makes 'no claim to a full understanding of Swift', a statement which, as the paper proves, is not to be taken at its face value. 'Full understanding' of Swift is unattainable. Nichol Smith's 'impressions' derived

⁴¹ *Bibliography of Eighteenth-Century English Literature*, by Frederic Ewen. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. 32. 2s.

⁴² *Burns Chronicle and Club Directory*. 2nd Series, vol. x. Kilmarnock: The Burns Federation. pp. viii + 212. 3s.

from detailed knowledge of his writings combined with a study of 'what he said intimately to his friends' assuredly go far to reveal the secret of a personality which has baffled most commentators. He believes 'that Swift was a definitely religious man with an overmastering sense of the weakness of human nature'.

Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century, by Lois Whitney (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934), has not been sent for notice in *The Year's Work*.

Was Ambrose Philips a Ballad Editor? is the question discussed in *Anglia* (lix. 1-2) by Lillian de la Torre Bueno, who gives her reasons for disbelieving that *A Collection of Old Ballads* was his work, but that of some one who was unacquainted with historical facts familiar to Philips and whose literary opinions were at variance with his. In lix. 3-4 of the same periodical, Otto L. Jiriczek investigates the significance of *Loda in Macpherson's Ossian*, and comes to the conclusion that 'Aus dem Odinstein wurden in ossianischer Sprache *the stones of Loden*—für Blair der Name des Gottes, für Macpherson der Kultstätte Loda'.

Otto L. Jiriczek's *Zur Bibliographie und Textgeschichte von Hugh Blair's Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian* should be noted in *Eng. Stud.* (Vol. 70, Part 1). In Part 3 Herbert Drennan investigates *Newtonianism in James Thomson's Poetry*, concluding that the poet was 'a scientific rationalist' who was profoundly influenced by the views of the school of Newton.

In *L. Mer.* (June) J. S. Collis writes of William Cobbett as 'the last and greatest of the old English peasants', 'a rebel . . . more conservative than any of his foes', one whose talent lay in his 'power to expose abuses'.

M.L.R. for April contains an article by James R. Sutherland entitled *A Note on the Last Years of Defoe*, in which he finds in a lawsuit in which Defoe figured the clue to the hitherto unexplained troubles that beset him in his last years.

Mod. Phil. (Nov., contd. in Feb. 1936) contains an article by Theodore F. M. Newton on *William Pittis and Queen Anne*

Journalism, which throws light on the political scurribilities of the time and the part played in them by Pittis, who usually preferred anonymity. Also in Nov. Arthur E. Case writes on *Pope, Addison, and the 'Atticus' lines*, supplementing Sherburn's account of their history by the discovery of a document, in the handwriting of Spence, containing the original version of his story about Gildon and Addison. This seems to show that the attack Pope had in mind was an anonymous pamphlet entitled *A true character of Mr. Pope and his writings*, which he erroneously ascribed to the joint efforts of Dennis and Gildon. This pamphlet appeared in 1716, two years before the *Memoirs of Wycherley*, and in the same year, as Pope alleged, he had sent the first sketch of his satire to Addison. The inference is that Pope's account of the business may be trusted: at any rate the chronological difficulty disappears. *Research Studies of the State College of Washington* (Dec.) includes *Some Notes on Fielding's Plays* by Emmett L. Avery, in which he deals with the dates of their first production.

In *The Satiric Background of the Attack on the Puritans in Swift's 'A Tale of a Tub'* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) C. M. Webster shows by means of a descriptive bibliography of satires between 1621 and 1700 that there was a long tradition of attack on Puritans in many ways resembling that of Swift himself. In the same periodical (June) Franklyn Bliss Snyder examines in detail the evidence concerning *Burns and the Smuggler Rosamond*, and Carroll Collier Moreland has an article on *Ritson's Life of Robin Hood*. Moreland concludes that uncritical as was Ritson's use of his material, he was so 'thorough and painstaking' that 'practically nothing has been added to [his] references' by subsequent scholars. In Sept. A. Watkins-Jones publishes for the first time the full text of three letters of Percy on the subject of the Rowley Poems. The article, *Bishop Percy, Thomas Warton, and Chatterton's Rowley Poems*, also shows the high esteem in which Chatterton was held by the two scholars, despite their disbelief in the authenticity of his manuscripts. In Dec., in *Forged Letters of Laurence Sterne*, Lewis P. Curtis examines forty-seven 'doubtful letters' in the light of various tests and shows why they cannot with any probability be attributed to Sterne.

A. Lytton Sells in *R.E.S.* (Jan.) considers *The History of Francis Wills: A Literary Mystery*, deciding that the evidence of authorship is inconclusive. It cannot be asserted that Goldsmith was not the author, but it is more probably the work of Arthur Murphy. In the same periodical (April) W. Vaughan Reynolds discusses *The Reception of Johnson's Prose Style*, concluding with the opinion that 'his composition embodied the ideals of a century marked by tireless inquiry into the principles of prose technique'. In July and Oct. H. W. Häusermann examines *Aspects of Life and Thought in 'Robinson Crusoe'*, paying attention specially to the influence of Calvinistic theology and the commercial and social elements to be found in it.

In *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly* (Oct.) Florence A. Smith investigates *The Light Reading of Dr. Johnson* and succeeds in proving 'his wholehearted enjoyment of romances', his admiration for fairy tales, and his approval of realistic fiction.

In *T.L.S.* the following contributions should be noted:

Feb. 14, *A Pope Problem*, by Howard P. Vincent (Authorship of *Mr. Taste's Tour*); Feb. 21, *John Wilkes in the Strand*, by Thos. B. Shepherd (publisher of Churchill's *Works*, 1767); Feb. 28, *Pope and Tickell*, by R. Eustace Tickell; Mar. 28, *The School for Scandal, An Early Edition*, by Geo. H. Nettleton; Apr. 4, 'Rasselas' in Dutch, by A. J. Barnouw; Apr. 25, *The Beggar's Opera*, by J. R. Sutherland (Its origin in *The Flying Post*), *Richardson on the Index*, by Florian J. Schleck (Banning of *Pamela*, 1744); May 2, *A Swift Epitaph*, by E. L. Allhusen; May 9, Reply by H. Williams; June 6, *Pope's Lost Sermon on Glass-Bottles*, by N. Ault; discussion continued June 13 by E. Heath and C.W.B., June 20 by G. Sherburn, June 27 by J. R. Sutherland, July 4 by N. Ault, July 11 by G. Sherburn; June 6, *The Drapier's Letters*, by H. Williams, *Letters of Laurence Sterne*, by Margaret Shaw; July 4, *Collins's Ode on Colonel Ross*, by E. H. W. Meyerstein, *A Riddle by Prior*, by J. R. Moore; July 11, *An Essay by Collins*, by Frederick Page; discussion continued July 25 by E. H. W. Meyerstein, Aug. 8 by E. Blunden; Aug. 29, *Rasselas and the Persian Tales*, by Geoffrey Tillotson, *Samuel Richardson and 'Sir William Harrington'*, by W. M. Sale, Jnr. (Evidence of Miss Meades's authorship);

Nov. 2, *Bowles and the Sonnet*, by Geoffrey Tillotson; Nov. 23, *Pope or Arbuthnot*, by J. R. Sutherland (Authorship of *Annus Mirabilis*, 1722); Dec. 21, *The School for Scandal: First Edition of the Authentic Text*, by G. H. Nettleton; *A Note on Robert Fergusson*, by D. Stuart Imrie; Dec. 28, *Smollett and the Case of James Annesley*, by Lewis M. Knapp.

XII

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

I. 1800–1860

By H. V. ROUTH

(1) *The Romantic Revival*

THE reader in search of some author who could introduce him to this year's study of the Romantic Movement would readily turn to H. C. Robinson and at once open Edith J. Morley's volume.¹ But he would be just a little disappointed, for this essay is itself only an introduction to the forthcoming selections from the diary and reminiscences. As such it is still very well worth reading. Miss Morley succeeds in creating an atmosphere which is fascinating and yet keeps your attention fixed on Crabb himself. Apart from this central figure the special student will be most interested in the comments passed on Tennyson, and the general reader will appreciate most the encounters with Goethe.

There is also a neatly written and satisfying essay² by L. E. Holman on Maria Kelly, an actress who won Lamb's admiration, and this study will be welcomed by students who seek a side-light on the early nineteenth century. The story of her life also illuminates Lamb himself from an unfamiliar angle. There are some sayings, episodes, and letters of his which become unforgettable when thrown into relief on this background; for instance his answer to Miss Kelly's letter, when she refused his offer of marriage. But for the most part this biography belongs to the history of the theatre.

When we come to monographs and direct studies, we have plenty of work on Lamb himself. E. V. Lucas's edition³ of the

¹ *The Life and Times of Henry Crabb Robinson*, by Edith J. Morley. Dent. pp. ix + 212. 10s. 6d.

² Lamb's 'Barbara S—': *The Life of Frances Maria Kelly, Actress*, by L. E. Holman. Methuen. pp. xi + 117. 6s.

³ *The Letters of Charles Lamb. To which are added those of his sister*

letters is not only remarkable as the first complete collection, containing over a thousand pieces, but also because of the notes, explanatory, informative, and corrective, which follow each letter. We have no space to hint at all the reader will find, but he or she should look out especially for the tribute paid by the editor and by Edmund Blunden to the personality of Mrs. Anderson. A perusal of the letters leads on to E. C. Johnson's *Lamb Always Elia*,⁴ which in a certain limited sense is a reply to F. V. Morley's contention⁵ that the essayist was destined by nature to be a man of action, or at least a leader in the march of civilization, but that he resigned these prospects when he dedicated his life to the care of his mad sister and used Elizabethan literature as an outlet or expression for his repressed impulses. Miss Johnson takes more or less the view of E. V. Lucas, that Lamb essentially fulfilled himself. In fact she retells the story of his life, showing that his environment shaped his mind as if in the course of nature. His conversations, friendships, and opinions, the places he visited, the letters he wrote were his very self. He was as one of his contemporaries. Like Wordsworth he fell under the influence of Coleridge; like Hazlitt, De Quincey, Hunt, and Southey he received the impulse to write from the development of nineteenth-century journalism. His mind was in some degree formed by his talent for sociability which rendered him the centre of so many 'at homes' in other houses besides his own. Miss Johnson displays a wide and deep knowledge of Lamb and uses her knowledge constructively. Her 75 pages of notes are full of interesting and unusual information.

Coleridge, the dominating personality of this period, has himself now been subjected to a process of close analysis and reconstruction.⁶ Stephen Potter has made an unmistakably determined effort to create the spirit, the ever changing but ever progressing purposiveness of this man of unstable purpose.

Mary Lamb, ed. by E. V. Lucas. Methuen. vol. i, pp. xlivi+432; vol. ii, pp. 467; vol. iii, pp. 468. 60s. the 3 vols.

⁴ *Lamb Always Elia*, by E. C. Johnson. Methuen. pp. xviii+288. 7s. 6d.

⁵ See *The Year's Work*, xiii. 282.

⁶ *Coleridge and S. T. C.*, by Stephen Potter. Cape. pp. 285. 8s. 6d.

Guided, perhaps, by his own discerning essay⁷ on D. H. Lawrence, the critic notes that Coleridge was not (like Lamb) all of a piece. He might have been so; a certain predominating drift runs through his inward and outward life; nor can his words be understood except in the light of this force. But the drift did not enjoy free play. Coleridge's personality was inhibited by his character; his self was held in check by his ego. Potter has set himself the task of examining this dualism which divided and nearly wrecked the poet's life, and of inquiring how far Coleridge freed himself from S. T. C. According to the critic's analysis the inhibiting and superimposed character appears in the poet's formalism, affectation, ego-centricity, self-contempt, and sometimes insincerity. The true fundamental Coleridge is to be recognized in the enthusiastic purposiveness of his pantisocratic creed; in his quest for ideas and convictions which would grow and evolve in his mind; in the quest for friends whose contact intensified his spiritual development, and helped him to study the universe with 'my shaping spirit of imagination'; in his cultivation of a religion which could reconcile his philosophy with his powers of emotional creativeness. This fusion was never quite effected; there was always a certain rift between what he felt and could perform; his self-expression could never equal his self-expressiveness. So he lost the capacity for naïve experience, and relapsed into an affected, artificial character, compact of cultivated ideas and literary mannerisms, especially after his first continental visit in 1806. The rest of his life was an effort to fuse these two identities—to unify acknowledged wishes with hidden needs. Hence his quest for Reason (as opposed to Understanding) by which he could merge his own will in the Will of Life. It follows that (contrary to the usual opinion) he did not decay, nor lose integrity, 'in the coils of the world and of his own character', but he descended into the depths to gather the threads together again and to be able to look out on this drab familiar world with the wonder and imagination of a child.

Thus literary scholarship is applied to clarify a moral and psychic problem of personal importance to every other reader

⁷ See *The Year's Work*, xi. 354.

of Coleridge. Compared with many critical essays, the inquiry almost constitutes a new departure—we shall notice something similar in Morgan's *Epitaph on George Moore*—but, of course, the scheme bristles with difficulties, and Potter sometimes rather obscures the issue or at least complicates it. His effort at synthesis is occasionally above his powers. But at his worst he is stimulating and at his best he cannot be read too carefully. He is good on Coleridge's choice of 'the seminative word', on his study of Shakespeare as an interpretation of his own psychological complexity, on his contact with friends as opportunities for self-discovery, on his study of Kant and Schelling as 'coequals in experience', above all on Coleridge's study of life (for instance in *Aids to Reflection, Hints towards the Formation of a more comprehensive theory of Life*). This elaborate study, of which only a few headings have been mentioned here, is indirectly illustrated by Miss Kennedy's *Bibliography*,⁸ which embraces not only editions, bibliographies, and criticisms, but also the evidence of his contacts and relationships.

Wordsworth has been subjected to a dissection no less unconventional and independent than that of his *quondam* friend Coleridge, and with results that are even more unsatisfying. W. L. Sperry, in *Wordsworth's Anti-climax*,⁹ reviews the usual reasons advanced to explain the poet's decline, and then goes on to maintain that 'the most dismal anti-climax of which the history of literature holds record' (H. W. Garrod) was due to none of these influences, nor to any special cause. The sterility which set in before 1810 was the natural and inevitable consequence of the former fruitfulness. The flame burnt itself out because there was nothing more to burn. Wordsworth was too consistent and firm-set. He could not adapt himself to the march of time and the progress of his own spirit, so he became necessarily hard and straitened as he descended into the vale of years. He wrote, in Jeffrey's phrase, 'avowedly for the

⁸ *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: a Selected Bibliography . . .*, compiled by Virginia W. Kennedy, assisted by Mary N. Barton. . . . Baltimore: The Enoch Pratt Free Library. pp. vii + 151.

⁹ *Wordsworth's Anti-climax*, by W. L. Sperry. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. vii + 228. \$2.50. 10s. 6d.

purpose of exalting a system'. It was based on Hartley's *Theory of the Human Mind*, on *The Principle of the Association of Ideas*, and probably on Alison's *Essay on Taste*. These treatises, together with Coleridge's conversations, had convinced him that 'innate ideas' play no part in creating poetry. In childhood we receive sense-impressions; these leave a deposit in the form of simple ideas, which are the memory of prior simple sensations. These simple ideas associate with one another and thus produce complex ideas, which become the normal food for thought. But to understand and feel them deeply we must analyse them, that is to say, trace them backwards, first to simple ideas, then to the sensations from which these simple ideas sprang. Thus we learn to live intensely and also to realize the continuity of our personality. Consequently, like Proust a century later, Wordsworth's studies of simple life and elemental experience were accomplished not so much for their own sake as for the sake of self-discovery, and for that reason they are too intellectual to breed new thoughts, and, were it not so, this theory of creativeness was bound to restrict the poet to a range of subjects soon to be exhausted. As Jeffrey says, he had sunk too much capital in a single venture.

Should the reader wish to examine and prove this explanation for himself, he will find no little help in E. de Selincourt's edition¹⁰ of the letters which Dorothy and Wordsworth wrote during the period in which the poet was giving his deepest and most powerful expression to all that he experienced both without and within; and he will also find a most useful commentary in B. Ifor Evans's anthology.¹¹ The value of a selection largely depends on whether it is primarily designed for schools or for unattached lovers of poetry who already know something of their author. Evans is obviously thinking of the beginner, and he is no doubt well advised to form his collection out of poems which appear in nearly every anthology. Even his two long excerpts from *The Prelude* are taken from the earlier books,

¹⁰ *The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth (1787-1805)*, arranged and edited by E. de Selincourt. O.U.P. pp. 578. 25s.

¹¹ *Selections from Wordsworth*, ed. by B. Ifor Evans. Methuen. pp. 217. 3s. 6d.

which are most usually read. But the introduction is well above the average; in fact, it is a remarkable condensation of Wordsworthian biography and scholarship. Some of his pronouncements might be queried, for instance, the assertion that this same *Prelude* 'remains his central achievement as a poet'; at some other times one would have liked to know the source and authority for some of the unexpected information he gives, especially in the notes which are most helpful for beginners. But whether it is Wordsworth or his commentator who speaks, there is something worth the attention of the most advanced students.

The same cannot be said of Peter Quennell's *Byron*,¹² which contains some interesting paragraphs on the rise of the middle class and on the extent and appearance of London, but is not concerned with the background of literature nor with the poet's position and artistic achievement, but with his character as revealed during the hectic years 1812–15. There is a surprising number of quotations; references, sources, and authorities are sometimes given; but for the most part the biography aims at being picturesque and fascinating. The result is a thoroughly readable volume, often suggestive if diffuse, but it leaves the reader with much the same impression as can be gathered from previous books.

There is much more to learn and enjoy in H. W. Donner's writings¹³ on T. L. Beddoes. His very ample selections, containing practically the whole literary output, with the selector's long introduction, are, of course, the reader's best starting-point, but the volume¹⁴ on Beddoes's character and development is most worth discussing here. This essay is a careful study by a man with an artistic conscience and a sense of literary tradition, who examines a minor poet in order to convince himself and us that creative inspiration is real and vital. So he dwells

¹² *Byron: the Years of Fame*, by Peter Quennell. Faber and Faber. pp. 383. 15s.

¹³ *The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes*, ed. by H. W. Donner. O.U.P. pp. lxiv + 834. 25s.

¹⁴ *Thomas Lovell Beddoes: the Making of a Poet*, by H. W. Donner. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 403. 18s.

first on the conflict in early nineteenth-century drama between the influences of the Renaissance and the Romantic Movement and inquires how far Beddoes (soon after his mother's death) fused the two elements in *Torrismond*; how thereafter he learnt to draw his imagery from 'the world of Spirits alive in an eternal life' and began to discard 'Elizabethanism'; how at Göttingen he studied medicine, partly in order to base his poetic ideas on scientific fact; how he grew so accustomed to the thought of death that it eventually became an inspiration full of calmness and idealism. In *Death's Jest-Book* we realize at what high argument the poet is aiming, what message he purposed to impart to the drama. His failure is fully discussed and the latter stages of his career, as politician, as well as poet and student. In the end the critic claims for him a position among the immortals of his age 'as a fragmentary genius whose struggle for perfection released the sources of human emotion and by the magic of art turned the adversities of fate into harmonious poetry'.

The more genial and sociable aspects of Beddoes's life have also been revealed by the same author in his curious collection¹⁵ of unpublished letters by great contemporaries to this man who then seemed great.

Meanwhile the study of Scott, through his letters, continues, thanks to the labours of Sir Herbert Grierson. Vol. viii¹⁶ carries the life three years further with 296 letters of which 200 have never before been printed and 64 never correctly printed. These documents are for the most part confined to Scott's private and family interests or to public events, though we also learn something of the publishing of *Redgauntlet* and of the origin of *Auld Robin Gray*. Vol. ix¹⁷ contains 190 letters never before printed and 68 never correctly printed. These lead up to the bankruptcy and bear witness first of all to their author's

¹⁵ *The Browning Box: or the Life and Works of T. L. Beddoes as reflected in Letters by his Friends and Admirers*, ed. by H. W. Donner. O.U.P. pp. xv+190. 15s.

¹⁶ *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott, 1823–1825*, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson, assisted by D. Cook, W. M. Parker, and others. Constable. vol. viii, pp. xviii+512. 18s.

¹⁷ *Letters ... 1825–6*. vol. ix, pp. xvi+509. 18s.

sanguine hopes, and then finally to his stoicism in disaster. All of them, whatever their tone and content, offer something better than biography or literary annotation—the revelation of a great character in contact with life, experience undistorted by the imaginative medium.

Keats's letters and *memorabilia* also continue to be searched and re-edited as the most reliable avenues to the vision of his genius. M. B. Forman's new one-volume edition¹⁸ is wholly admirable. This publication has gained both by its additions and subtractions (of price as well as of matter), but is in substance the counterpart of the two-volume edition which has already¹⁹ been discussed. The reader can be left to form his own opinion of their value.

He must also, by now, have formed his own idea of Clare's poetical genius, after reading Blunden's and Alan Porter's selection of the best work; and these impressions will be corroborated or corrected by J. W. Tibble's more complete edition.²⁰ It is now much easier to assess as well as enjoy the Northamptonshire peasant, because this new collection of his works, created out of Clare's own unedited MSS., enables the student to examine his best poems (mostly from the earlier nature poems and the 'asylum lyrics') in their proper setting. We can appreciate the directness, vividness, spontaneity, and simplicity of these verses and especially the way their author handled his words so as to renew and prolong the rapture with which Nature inspired him. The editor's short but studied introduction does ample justice to these qualities, while recognizing that there are some excellencies to which Clare could not lay claim.

When turning from the poets to the prose writers, it will be agreed that Jane Austen,²¹ at any rate, has now been as clearly

¹⁸ *The Letters of John Keats*, ed. by Maurice Buxton Forman. 2nd ed. with revisions and additional letters. O.U.P. pp. lxix + 561. 12s. 6d.

¹⁹ *The Year's Work*, xii. 274.

²⁰ *The Poems of John Clare*, ed. by J. W. Tibble. Dent. vol. i, pp. xxxii + 569; vol. ii, pp. 567. 25s.

²¹ *Jane Austen*, by Lord David Cecil. *Leslie Stephen Lecture*. C.U.P. pp. 43. 1s. 6d.

and enthusiastically appraised as any of the foregoing authors. It is surprising how much Lord David Cecil can put into his one hour's talk. At the first hearing or reading, it does not seem that the critic has anything very new to say. He dwells on Jane Austen's technical accomplishment and then on the absorbing, searching interest she awakens in the mind ; he explains how she is 'the last exquisite blossom' of that eighteenth-century habit of mind which he terms the 'moral realistic view'. That is to say, she believes that we live only to be good, but that we can become good only if we have sense and taste—goodness means good manners. Yet these impressions are expounded with such wit, enthusiasm, and niceness of illustration that they force themselves into their reader's mind as new and illuminating truths and we feel that, if ourselves in doubt on any personal, moral problem, we should follow the lecturer's example: we should consult not Flaubert, Dostoevsky, Balzac, Dickens, or even Tolstoi, but the subject of this discerning address.

A survey of this period can conveniently be closed by E. A. Baker's *History of the Novel*,²² since the sixth and most recent instalment of this monumental work discusses Jane Austen and Scott as well as Maria Edgeworth. While perusing these carefully written pages the reader will probably feel that the author's method and style are (in a good sense) old-fashioned. Baker takes his novelist, tells the story of his or her life, reminds the reader of his or her literary ancestors, then summarizes and analyses the principal novels in chronological order. The method is old-fashioned in that nowadays one writes about novelists as one writes novels ; that is to say, one re-creates a character or personality in which the achievements and antecedents show up through the surface as parts of the finished outline. An artist's career survives only in the final, composite impression. This modernism is frequently very serviceable because some authors' careers have been so often covered, and Baker does not escape telling us many things which have been told before. Besides, his style is so leisurely, his exposition so explicit, and his quotations so numerous that he takes up much

²² *The History of the English Novel . . . Edgeworth, Austen, Scott,* by E. A. Baker. Witherby. pp. 277. 16s.

space to make sure that every brick in his building is in the proper place. On the other hand, his book is one of the most helpful as well as authoritative guides to beginners; and even experts, if they find much they know, will find no little that they have forgotten; his scholarship is not in the least pedantic and his style, like his mind, is admirably lucid.

(2) *The Victorian Era*

Amy Cruse's *The Victorians*²³ is a most welcome introduction to this period, all the more because it is unusual. The approach is not through the mind of the authoritative and final critics, still less through the lives and aspirations of the great authors, but through the atmosphere of contemporary culture and pseudo-culture. The poets, novelists, and essay-writers are almost taken for granted. The real theme is the diaries, letters, *memorabilia*, newspapers, and popular publications which reveal the moods of the readers. So this book has long been needed as a companion, not a substitute, for the standard histories of literature. Yet the serious, or at least the exacting, student will be a little disappointed, for he will find that Mrs. Cruse's knowledge, though commendably wide, does not penetrate deeply enough. She is so much influenced by the misjudgements and superficialities of the Victorian public that she becomes like it. For instance, she explains quite adequately the aspirations of the early Victorians—so much so, that her chapters on the Oxford Movement, 'The Two Nations', and 'The New Woman' are among her best; but she misses the significance of later Victorianism. She has no interest in the age of Meredith and Samuel Butler; she is unconvincing on 'The Aesthetes' and she closes her review in the 'eighties. Moreover, though she quotes hundreds of authors, she rarely tells us where the opinions are to be found, and most of her assertions are not backed or corroborated by any authority or evidence. We must take her conclusions on faith. In most cases the reader is prepared to agree with her, but even so he misses something—access to those sources of information which she is to be envied for possessing.

²³ *The Victorians and their Books*, by Amy Cruse. Allen and Unwin. pp. 444. 12s. 6d.

De Quincey can most conveniently be rated as a Victorian, so this is the place to note M. Elwin's eminently readable monograph,²⁴ which is rather too independent, in fact irresponsible, in tone, but is stored with a quite unusual amount of information, all of it lightly and effectively handled. The essay is avowedly a 'life' not an appreciation, so the biographer confines himself to the events of his author's career, or to the characteristics which influenced those events or resulted from them—a theme quite inspiring enough in itself. Yet he has managed to convey an unforgettable impression of De Quincey's other life of imagination and mystic experience. Perhaps he is inclined to forget that this dreamer of dreams was also an acute reasoner whose grasp of, for instance, political economy is still respected.

To pass to dreamers of another world, we open E. M. Delafield's *The Brontës*²⁵ and find that the biography is, as claimed in the advertisement, 'unique', in that it consists of retold contemporary documents. These are all, or nearly all, known to specialists (many are from Mrs. Gaskell's *Life*) and have already been rehandled and recast by subsequent biographers, and therefore a discussion of their importance does not come within our scope. It is enough to say that this compilation creates a curious atmosphere of reality. The personalities seem more alive and more of a piece precisely because they are each reflected in a diversity of opinions. They become as varied and many-sided as life; and besides, the student has the documents before him and can judge for himself; especially if he supplements this evidence with H. E. Wroot's researches²⁶ into the sources of the novels.

The reader will also welcome M. H. Shackford's introduction²⁷ to two literary figures familiar to all by name but strangers to most in their writings. The essay on Mrs. Browning

²⁴ *De Quincey*, by M. Elwin. Great Lives. Duckworth. pp. 144. 2s.

²⁵ *The Brontës: Their Lives recorded by their Contemporaries*, with an Introduction by E. M. Delafield. The Hogarth Press. pp. 274. 8s. 6d.

²⁶ *Sources of Charlotte Brontë's Novels, Persons and Places*, by H. E. Wroot. The Caxton Press for the Brontë Society. pp. 214. 5s.

²⁷ *E. B. Browning, R. H. Horne: Two Studies*, by M. H. Shackford. The Wellesley Press. pp. 75. 75 cents.

is a discussion of *Aurora Leigh*, combining a very clear account of the poem with an examination of the conditions out of which the poem developed its tone and tendency, drawing attention to the many novels (in French as well as English) which coloured Mrs. Browning's mind, and emphasizing her sense of humour, her plea for the liberty of women and the influence exercised on her mind by Mme de Staël (*Corinne*), G. Sand, and, of course, Robert Browning. The essay on R. H. Horne is no less informative. Besides a picturesque and sympathetic sketch of his life and a review of his friends (all interesting elements in the Victorian scene), Miss Shackford discusses her author's dramas with scholarly insight as well as interest. She is particularly interesting on *Gregory VII*, the most ambitious and the least read of his tragedies.

There is not much work on Tennyson worth recording, for D. Bush²⁸ has chosen in his essay on the classical poems a theme too big for the limited space at his command. Nor need we spend much time over H. Law-Robertson's essay on Walt Whitman²⁹ in Germany, part of which deals with German translators (J. Schlaf at their head) and the other part with the German ideas and aspirations which (as Law-Robertson admits) admirers insisted on discovering in *Leaves of Grass*. Thus the monograph is of more interest to students of German than of English literature, except in so far as this foreign cult brings out the remarkable features of the American: his democracy which meant humanity; his monism and nature-worship; his dream of a superman which encouraged Germans to identify his gospel with Nietzsche's; his war-spirit; his expressionism. Thomas Mann's admiration is an interesting side-light.

Nor can one feel more than passing interest for *Boz: an Intimate Biography*,³⁰ though the life-story and the 'Intimate

²⁸ *The Personal Note in Tennyson's Classical Poems*, by D. Bush. *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. iv, no. 2.

²⁹ *Walt Whitman in Deutschland*, von H. Law-Robertson. Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, xlvi. Giessen. pp. 91. RM. 3.50.

³⁰ *Boz: an Intimate Biography of Charles Dickens*, by J. C. Boarman and J. L. Harte, with character sketches by M. H. Boarman. Boston: The Stratford Co. pp. iii + 234. \$2.00.

'Word-Sketches of Dickens's Important Characters' are alike performed with genuine appreciation amounting to devotion. They contribute nothing new to the study of the novelist.

The letters addressed to Mrs. Gaskell which repose in the John Rylands Library and have now been edited by Miss R. D. Waller³¹ would seem to promise more, till one remembers the novelist's incurable passion for autographs which inspired her to exact letters from correspondents who had nothing particular to write about. A few of the notes arise out of biographical events, as, for instance, the publication of *Mary Barton*, but the majority, though interlinked by the editor's commentary, are interesting only as specimens of nineteenth-century epistolary style.

We get something more solid in Susanne Howe's life³² of Geraldine Jewsbury. The heroine was not a great writer. Neither her essays nor her novels really deserve to live. Miss Howe knows as much and has confined her very considerable ability to the telling of a life-story, founded on facts, but none the less fascinating as a romantic comedy. Such is its value to students of literature. Miss Jewsbury was erratic, impulsive, and irresponsible. She also had talent and personality, so she mixed with the great Victorians, and her letters and *memorabilia* are so many indispensable streaks in the background on which the giants move. As the biographer remarks in the *Epilogue*, 'We may fit all the pieces together, but the real essence of Victorianism eludes us. We shall never quite find our way back into Miss Jewsbury's world, and in this lies the secret of its fascination. We can never quite leave it alone.' Miss Jewsbury exhales this atmosphere, she is important in the study of what we might call secularism.

The same is true of Dickens's letters to his wife.³³ These

³¹ *Letters addressed to Mrs. Gaskell by Celebrated Contemporaries, now in the possession of the John Rylands Library*, ed. by R. D. Waller. Manchester Univ. Press. pp. 70. 2s.

³² *Geraldine Jewsbury. Her Life and Errors*, by Susanne Howe. Allen and Unwin. pp. xv + 236. 10s.

³³ *Mr. and Mrs. Charles Dickens. His Letters to Her*, with a Foreword

documents, which Mrs. Dickens was anxious to preserve as a proof that her husband once loved her, and that the estrangement was due to no 'fault' of hers, were eventually consigned to the British Museum in a sealed packet not to be opened till all the family were dead. They contain the raw material of a domestic drama which began as comedy and ended as something like tragedy. As such, they have a certain value for future biographers, especially the appendixes, but otherwise we need not pry into the secrets of hearts. Their real significance lies in all the sights and sounds which the novelist records and recounts to his wife—those odd, out-of-the-way touches of Victorian life which are so difficult to catch and mean so much to the student of that age.

The latter half of the nineteenth century brought with it many searchings of heart and inward experiences which found more or less inadequate expression in letter-writing. Among those who tell to their friends and not to the public the story of that period, G. M. Hopkins is now beginning to attract much attention, and so C. C. Abbott's volumes of his correspondence will appropriately close this review. The letters addressed to Robert Bridges³⁴ will be the first to be read. With the help of the Introduction, they create a most curious portrait, the mind of an absolutely sincere Christian who began his career as a sensitive and rather sensuous boy-poet in revolt against everything; who went up to Balliol in 1863, at the time of Oxford's second religious ferment, and gradually passed 'from the doctrines of Pusey to the Roman Catholic Faith', and who henceforth was always divided between the worship of God through Jesuitism and through poetry. His character seems to have been so complex and responsive that he could never quite reconcile the claims and duties of a priest with the self-devotion and self-study of an artist; his writings all aim at balance and spiritual perfection and yet are generally discussed as experiments in prosody, in the techniques of stress and of sprung

by their daughter Kate Perugini and Notes, Appendices, &c., by W. Dexter. Constable. pp. xvii+299. 10s.

³⁴ *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges*, ed. by C. C. Abbott. O.U.P. 2 vols. pp. xlvii+322. 30s.

rhythm. Such is the man revealed to us partly through Bridges and partly through Abbott who draws their two portraits and incidentally makes some interesting comparisons between Hopkins and the Metaphysical School, but mostly through the letters themselves.

The correspondence of Hopkins with the Rev. R. W. Dixon³⁵ is in one sense even more curious, since it has brought to light a figure who will one day be recognized as a member of the immortals, however subordinate, and entitled to his own edition of 'Works', complete with introduction. It is fascinating to watch the interchange of critical and aesthetic ideas which emanates from this interchange of letters. But it should be borne in mind that the two correspondents were brother poets and churchmen who hardly ever met, but exchanged poems and criticisms. The Introduction, which reviews the work of Dixon, is admirably scholarly though perhaps just a trifle too academic for so modest a poet, who saved himself from routine by writing a church history in six volumes and by composing poetry which won him no sort of recognition, except from Hopkins and Bridges.

³⁵ *The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon*, ed. by C. C. Abbott. O.U.P. 2 vols. pp. xxxi+591. 30s.

XIII

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

II

By H. V. ROUTH

THE twentieth century surely began with Samuel Butler, though he died at its dawn, and J.-B. Fort's elaborate studies¹ are even less unmistakably a product of our age. They demonstrate the extremes of specialization and neo-scholasticism. Butler is after all a very secondary figure in our literary scene, and conspicuous for his inconspicuous, pedestrian style. Yet his mannerisms are anatomized with an industry, patience, and technical efficiency such as Shakespeare or Milton would exact. The critic promises to trace Butler's otherwise inconsiderable eccentricities of manner to his imitativeness, early education, and instinctive reactions. He does, indeed, remind us that Butler's literary psychology was a mixture of timidity and assurance and that although he professed never to write except when the ideas clamoured for expression, yet he took endless trouble with his compositions (as some interesting reproductions of manuscripts and galley-proof demonstrate). But there is little in the volume which really reveals the mentality of this eccentric figure. In exchange, we have a demonstration of French post-graduate methods: a scientific analysis of punctuation, vocabulary, syntax, imagery, repetitiousness, and some generalizations on his different styles which are divided into familiar, philosophical, and narrative. However, the inquiry is excellently documented.

So with the other much bulkier volume which examines Butler's character and intelligence. We follow the details of his life from the earliest family influences to the rather mysterious causes of his last illness and death. We examine the success and failure of his books; the qualities of his friends; his irony, satire, critical ability, and philosophical position; his

¹ *Samuel Butler. L'Écrivain: Étude d'un Style*, by J.-B. Fort. Bordeaux: Bière. pp. 146. *Samuel Butler (1835–1902): Étude d'un Caractère et d'une Intelligence*, by J.-B. Fort. Bordeaux: Bière. pp. 515.

conception of money, gentlemen, life, and of Darwin ; how far his mind was Victorian ; how far anti-Victorian. Fort has certainly covered all the ground, especially the letters, which are admirably documented and profusely quoted. Now and then he strikes on an interesting idea or original view, as for instance, the suggestion that monasteries and pictures aroused Butler's curiosity because of *son flair pour les énigmes* ; or that his theory of Shakespeare's sonnets was really inspired by his own admiration for Pauli which ended in disillusionment ; how the death of his father in 1895 enlarged, without breaking, the continuity of his career ; how he belonged to the pre-Baconians, to the school of philosophical *apriorisme*, whereas he was born in the golden age of observation, experimentation, and statistics. But for the most part, Fort is content to say everything at length and without discrimination ; very useful to French students quite unfamiliar with the material, but not for most of us.

As a contrast to this prolix treatment, the reader should glance at H. Davis's article,² which is as adequate as one can expect from an essay which tries to be comprehensive and condensed. The critic gives a good idea of Butler's scientific position, and of his attitude to society and morals (based on that position), and suggests that the man who prepared the way for the 'twenties has remained unpopular because he was, after all, a Bloomsbury highbrow.

If Butler helped to renew English culture by reviving older methods of thought, Charles Doughty tried to hasten that same rebirth by reviving older forms of speech. The author of *Arabia Deserta* and *The Dawn in Britain* was a Victorian in that he revolted against the insipid verbosity of Victorian literature. He became an author because he was bent on asserting the nervous energy, the purity of English at its best, unsullied by nineteenth-century associations. Such is the aspect under which Miss Treneer³ presents this lonely but imposing

² *Samuel Butler: 1835–1902*, by H. Davis. *Rpt. Univ. of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. v, no. i, pp. 16.

³ *Charles M. Doughty: a Study of his Prose and Verse*, by Anne Treneer. Cape. pp. 350. 10s. 6d.

figure. She enters most thoroughly into his aims and methods, pointing out that Chaucer, more often than Spenser, was his model; examining the rhythms of his prose, and the metrical systems of his poetry, not omitting to give very readable descriptions of all his works, with illustrative excerpts. She is probably at her best in the study of Doughty's vocabulary (at which the general reader shudders), but all her judgements are well worth while, for she recognizes the defects of her author, though inclined to insist on his qualities. He wanted freedom; perhaps too much freedom for the genius of the language; but he succeeded in composing poems which are 'closed systems', that is, compositions which subsist on their creator's enthusiasm, which do not depend on any adventitious interest. In one rather interesting passage she believes or at least hopes that in the immediate future books like C. D. Lewis's *A Hope for Poetry* will number Doughty with Wilfred Owen, G. M. Hopkins, and T. S. Eliot as an ancestor of the new poetry. So altogether Miss Treneer is likely to send many readers to *Arabia Deserta* and *The Dawn in Britain*, unless they find in her book all that need be known about its subject.

Some of her conclusions can be tested in B. Fairley's selections,⁴ which embrace seventy excerpts, mostly short, to illustrate the qualities which the reader may expect in the complete poem. There is no attempt to represent the range and scope of the epic. The Introduction dwells on Doughty's 'radical feeling for the unit of speech, his concrete apprehension—his thing-sense—of the isolated world', and draws attention to his kinship with the technique and artistry of G. M. Hopkins.

From Doughty to H. James seems at first to be a far cry; yet not so far, in one sense, since the novelist and man of society was as deeply in earnest about his art as was the traveller and poet. Both were purists in their own individual ways. Such is the impression left by James's Prefaces which R. P. Blackmur has now collected,⁵ and which have for some time been recog-

⁴ *Selected Passages from 'The Dawn in Britain'* of Charles Doughty, arranged with an Introduction by Barker Fairley. Duckworth. pp. xxi + 110. 3s. 6d.

⁵ *The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James*, with an Introduction by R. P. Blackmur. Scribner. pp. xxxix + 348. 10s. 6d.

nized as classics, of which the student needs no appraisement. The Introduction, which analyses and reviews the different types of preface, will be especially welcome in that it puts the reader into the right mood—leads him to expect that he is about to enter into *the art of life*.

It is, however, something of an experience to pass to Myrtle C. Henry's *John Trevena*.⁶ The value of this thesis largely depends on the value to be attached to E. G. Henham, who wrote dreamy and thoughtful novels, or rather, studies in human affinities and spiritual intuitions among troubled and care-crossed mortals on a Dartmoor background, and, as such, may still figure in the history of the twentieth-century novel. Miss Henry certainly knows how to tell the history of his mind and art and to give a scholarly explanation of his mysticism, idealism, and natural scenery.

One is less confident about *Anthony Hope and his Books*.⁷ Hope was not a great novelist. Both he and his friends knew his limitations and sometimes doubted whether it was prudent or even commendable to forgo a career at the Bar or in Parliament, merely to earn a living by fiction. Yet the life-story of this suave and successful creator of '*prose de société*' might have become an interesting commentary on Edwardian culture if only the biographer had made the most of his opportunity. But the expectations of the reader will be disappointed, though Sir Charles Mallet is an historian of Oxford, an authority on the life of Herbert Gladstone, heads a chapter with 'Oxford in the 'Eighties', and promises to recount the initial difficulties of a young author of fifty years ago. On the other hand, the student a little tired of the calamities of authors, and of the gladiatorialism of post-Victorian times, will enjoy a blessed holiday among the triumphs and successes of this 'compleat gentleman' of the older régime, who began life as a barrister, then cautiously drifted into fiction, and always cultivated the

⁶ *John Trevena: a Study, with Special Reference to the Romantic Elements in his Work*, by Myrtle Catherine Henry. Philadelphia. pp. 127.

⁷ *Anthony Hope and his Books: Being the authorized Life of Sir Anthony Hope Hawkins*, by Sir Charles Mallet. Hutchinson. pp. 290. 18s.

self-knowledge and contemplative calm of Marcus Aurelius and made £70,000 in ten years.

The reader can then pass on to Richard Jefferies, who sought the same spiritual ends by very different means. E. F. Daglish⁸ first recounts and then with his selections illustrates how Jefferies learnt to love nature on a Wiltshire farm and after many a rebuff conquered the London public with his studies of birds, animals, flowers, and the open-air; how he ended in creating out of wild life a philosophy by which a town dweller may live and even bear to die a death of slow disease.

One of the outstanding events of the publishing year concerns an author who had something in common with all these last four authors—John Galsworthy, whose *Life and Letters*⁹ is now before us. This exhaustive compilation is not so much written by H. V. Marrot as by all the letter writers whose correspondence he has so industriously collected, including those of Galsworthy himself. Of course the biographer tells the story of his boyhood and youth, and of the years of obscurity, and keeps a guiding hand on the accumulating mass of documentation; but in other respects he has the judgement to efface himself, no doubt realizing that it was a big enough achievement to call this richly illustrated volume into life. As a consequence, its pages have a wide appeal for the general reader who likes to know everything about a very prominent author, for instance, how far the elder Forsytes are copied from Galsworthy's relatives; how long he had to wait before he could marry the woman he loved so dearly through all his life; or the moment when his books began to pay, after being published for ten years at a loss. The biography will also appeal to students of the twentieth century who want to know how far this author influenced Churchill in the reform of prisons, or in what terms he wrote to his contemporaries about the suffragettes, or worried over the Great War. For the student of

⁸ *Out-of-Doors with Richard Jefferies*, ed. by E. F. Daglish. Dent. pp. xvi+264. 3s. 6d.

⁹ *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*, by H. V. Marrot. Heinemann. pp. xv+819. 21s.

literature the most interesting letters are those from fellow craftsmen (especially E. V. Lucas, Edward Garnett, Gilbert Murray, and above all Conrad), applauding or criticizing his earlier efforts. For instance, the reader should look out for the discussion as to whether Bosinney should be killed or commit suicide; whether the landed aristocracy was the kind of subject which Galsworthy understood; how *Justice* rises above our earthly muddles into the super-terrestrial world of divine governance (as Sophocles and Gilbert Murray would say); how *The Roof* compares with *The Skin Game*. Above all, the book presents Galsworthy as the humanist rather than the humanitarian, the artist trying to gather together his impressions and sculpture them in the true human outline, to get a bird's-eye view of the situation which embraces all causes and consequences, not the one-sided departmental idea derived from individual contacts.

As far as he was a conscientious artist, Galsworthy was akin to George Moore, whose biography was to have been written by Charles Morgan. That project has been abandoned because he was denied access to a body of letters which are indispensable, and the *Life* has finally passed into other hands and will be discussed next year. Morgan, however, being unable to write a biography, has written an *Epitaph*¹⁰ or, rather, a portrait, of no small value to all students of modern literature. It is the 'story of a man who made himself because he imagined himself', and in every novel tried to repress a certain foolish, flashy, and superficial trait in his nature, the instinct of an outwardly ineffectual man about town, and to lay the foundations of his artistic life. He tried to rescue and re-create his intellectual personality by self-discipline and literary craftsmanship. So he passed from life to life, at each stage pursued by his dead self which would not die. At the age of fifty-one he was still stumbling. Then he published *The Untilled Field* (1903) and *The Lake* (1905), under the influence of Turgeniev, and these two efforts opened to him a new artistic life, though the battle of self-creation had still to be fought anew each day.

¹⁰ *Epitaph on George Moore*, by Charles Morgan. Macmillan. pp. 56.
58.

Despite this vitality which culminated in genius, Moore has never been popular in England because (in Morgan's opinion) he is always considered to be too 'French', that is to say, he sees everything—especially a woman—with the eye of a connoisseur. Some critics, for instance Susan Mitchell, accuse him of being 'unspiritual'. Morgan retorts that no man can be such who is fanatically dedicated to an unmaterial end, and Moore's life was devoted to one achievement, 'a constructive simplification of prose narrative', and in his work we detect 'a disciplined fluency that belongs to a new voice in literature'.

George Moore was, as every one knows, an Irishman, and at about the age of forty he came to Dublin and offered himself as a champion of the Gaelic Revival. Every one who has dipped into *Hail and Farewell* also knows how he quarrelled with his fellow adventurers and finally abandoned the enterprise. But during that period he formed a friendship with John Eglinton, who has now published his reminiscences¹¹ of the movement. The essay on George Moore is one of the best, and besides creating some idea of his personality, gives several glimpses of his artistic aims, but like the other studies—on Yeats, A. E., Dowden, and Joyce—the tone is too personal and descriptive to serve as more than a relaxation to the reader.

We return to a much more serious and professional mood in George Gordon's inaugural lecture¹² at Oxford on modern poetry. The address is of unusual interest and importance. He traces the present movement back to pre-War days—1912 if not earlier—with Bridges and Yeats for pioneers. Since then, the leaders of the younger generation seem to have been first G. M. Hopkins and T. S. Eliot; then W. H. Auden, Stephen Spender, and Day Lewis; and the Professor of Poetry is delightfully witty and concise in his review of what these poets and their followers have attempted and achieved. Possibly he is at his best, or at least most helpful, when describing Eliot's

¹¹ *Irish Literary Portraits*, by John Eglinton. Macmillan. pp. 158.
5s.

¹² *Poetry and the Moderns*, by George Gordon. O.U.P. pp. 33. 2s.

method: his fundamental traditionalism, disguised beneath a new art of abrupt contrasts and transitions between the fair and foul of modern civilization, and an almost psychical suggestiveness, which the reader is apt to miss. Yet somehow Gordon seems unable to make up our minds for us, or indeed to have quite made up his own. He certainly thinks that all contemporary poets claim to be more original than they are, and that all, if less subversive, are more intolerant than is desirable. One of his best points is his emphasis on the *specialism* of this age: the lack of catholic taste and ideals, the contraction of interest to certain personal problems (for instance, view-points and prosodic methods) with the result that neither readers nor writers seem able to like anything very much without violently disliking everything else.

The Oxford Professor of Poetry speaks of T. S. Eliot with a certain reserve, but no such sense of responsibility weighs upon F. O. Matthiessen,¹³ who interprets the same poet by the light of the very modernists. In fact the chief value of the monograph lies in the author's sense of contemporary culture. Thus he brings out well the necessity for concentrating on the rhythm and movement of a poem, which often penetrate far below the conscious level of thought and arouse deeper feelings than words can express, and meanwhile the mind gradually furnishes itself with the information required to understand the verbal import. Yet the centre of value does not rest in the poet's feelings. Again and again the critic insists that we must not look so much for the artist's emotions as for the pattern which he makes of them, the 'intensity of the artistic process, the pressure, so to speak, under which the fusion takes place'. At the same time he admits that every great artist achieves a certain reading of his age—its weakness and horror, but also its potentiality for goodness, truth, and courage, even a vision of their transfiguring glory. These doctrines are expounded to explain the pre-eminence of T. S. Eliot, and Matthiessen certainly does well to emphasize his poet's eye for the essential detail; his artistic purpose in his sudden contrasts

¹³ *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot: an Essay on the Nature of Poetry*, by F. O. Matthiessen. O.U.P. pp. xvi+160. 7s. 6d.

and transitions of thought; his love of interplay between the regularity and irregularity of metre; above all his cult of auditory imagination. He also does good work in interpreting as well as quoting some of Eliot's most perplexing enigmas. It is also worth while to follow him in his study of Eliot's debt to Baudelaire and Arnold. But the reader will do well to remember that this study is a piece of special pleading and rather diffuse and repetitious at that.

As in the discussion of Eliot, so in Fabre-Luce's *La Vie de D. H. Lawrence*,¹⁴ the events of his career are narrated only so far as they aided or obstructed the growth of his spirit. The book is a biography of a mind. Even his novels are mentioned only as fugitive illustrations. The biographer exercises his craft as would an artist. He begins with a portrait of the man's character and appearance, or, rather, of his personality. Then, of course, he reviews his home and unhappy youth, in which the future novelist first learnt to live as an insurgent against all the imprisonments of society. Then comes a notable chapter on Lawrence's experiences as a lover; especially his idea of love as an act of nature, as something deeper than the intellect, a relationship in which physical contact was to lead eventually to the fusion of two souls in a state of spiritual calm. Then we follow the effect of the Great War on his mind; then his project of organizing a 'free society', which ended in ridicule; then his quest of spiritual freedom, in isolation, as he wandered from one Continent to another. The critic, who several times compares his author to Nietzsche, makes perhaps too much of Lawrence's inspiration. Does his genius really prefigure the dawn of a more spacious and purer religion? But he is surely justified in leaving us with the impression that we have none of us yet the wisdom to learn to the full the art of living—nor had D. H. Lawrence.

These monographs bear witness to the interest taken in contemporary literature; the more collective studies, like Gordon's, are even stronger evidence. For this reason the

¹⁴ *La Vie de D. H. Lawrence*, by Alfred Fabre-Luce. Paris: Grasset. pp. 220. 12 fr.

lectures¹⁵ on recent developments delivered at the University of Sydney are worth considering. It is significant that none of the three lecturers is dazzled by these modernists. In fact they regard each manifestation as a passing phase, not to be taken too seriously; an ebullition, enigmatic only because there is no answer to the riddle. However, A. J. Waldock gives a refreshingly succinct and intelligible idea of *Ulysses*, R. G. Howarth an excellent explanation of Miss Sitwell's 'sense-confusion', and E. J. Dobson a clear-cut statement of T. S. Eliot's position.

The academic mind seems to attribute modern iconoclasm and eccentricity to a streak of wilfulness in the character of these experimenters, but a quite different explanation is offered by Stephen Spender. His spirited, contentious, inconclusive, and therefore disappointing book¹⁶ lays the responsibility on civilization. Modern capitalism cannot supply the spiritual experiences—the hopes, beliefs, aspirations, goodness, and self-fulfilment—which the creative artist must have if he is to project his spirit into the world around him. Consequently our most receptive and expressive writers either seek their material in their own inward consciousness, maintaining as little contact as possible with their uncongenial environment, or they assert their artistic integrity by taking this material in both hands and re-creating it in all its true horror and vulgarity; or again, they attempt to create the communistic world which should supplant it. Whatever their purpose, their thought has an undercurrent of political as well as social pre-occupation. This explanation of twentieth-century disillusionment may have much to recommend it—Matthew Arnold would have agreed when writing about Gray—but before the argument can become effective the critic must get close to facts. Is 'the destructive element' due to lack of faith or lack of ability? The answer is doubtful, and any solution must depend on a carefully documented and comparative study of the history of culture, in-

¹⁵ *Some Recent Developments in English Literature: Lectures on James Joyce, Edith Sitwell, and T. S. Eliot.* Sydney: Australasian Publishing Co. pp. 54.

¹⁶ *The Destructive Element: A Study of Modern Writers and Beliefs,* by Stephen Spender. Cape. pp. 284. 8s. 6d.

volving many other and different sources than the writings of Karl Marx. Spender shirks these issues. Not that his essay is superficial. On the contrary, his head seems to be the meeting-place and maze of modern ideas, including the latest psychology of aestheticism, and medical pathology. Moreover, he has acquired a remarkable insight into the mentality of his authors, and the significance of their imagery. But his mind lacks historical perspective and has not yet the cunning to reshape, simplify, and co-ordinate his ideas.

His most helpful chapters are those on Henry James, for which he had the assistance of others. In these pages he argues that James was not so much the admiring chronicler of the leisured and moneyed upper class, as an artist who strove to create and sustain an organic pattern of life, to substantiate a dream of what culture could and should be. His career was a protest against the philistinism and money-worship of that polite society, which drove any sensitive and sensible man to create an 'inward organ of life', as an escape from the spiritual death around him. Such is Spender's stimulating but questionable interpretation, and he supports his thesis by the evidence to be derived from the drafts of *The Ivory Tower* and *The Sense of the Past*. 'To grasp the whole pattern, to breathe all the excitement and to follow all the difficult yet urgent thematic arguments, one has to read these notes.'

Meanwhile a prominent novelist of much greater experience has produced a much more comprehensive review which is almost as disappointing as Spender's. F. Swinnerton's *Panorama*¹⁷ might have been excellent. There is no need to deplore the critic's journalistic scope and method; he has long acquired the habits of a literary annalist and he is therefore enabled to write with a nearness and power of observation, with an air of *actuality*, most welcome, if rare, in literary studies. He seems to be living with the men and women he labels, and most of them are personally known to him. Above all, he really has *felt* the change which began to creep over style and sentiment from the Boer War onwards. No reader can doubt that he has

¹⁷ *The Georgian Literary Scene: a Panorama*, by Frank Swinnerton. Heinemann. pp. x+548. 12s. 6d.

held his finger on the pulse of Grub Street. Thanks to this awareness, his chapters on James, Conrad, A. E. Housman, and D. H. Lawrence are especially noteworthy, and he makes a good point when he insists on the novelist's difficulty (e.g. Galsworthy's) in identifying himself with personages outside his own class, unless poverty, at some time or other, has washed off his hall-mark. Yet however much the reader may enjoy this comprehensive review, he will miss a comprehensiveness of judgement, and this defect vitiates the book. It seems that Swinnerton, in his horror of pedantry and his zeal for the ideal of the plain man, has fallen a victim to the plain man's self-consciousness. In order not to be a second Matthew Arnold, he has forgotten Arnold's principle of detachment. He keeps to his subject; but he writes as if the reader's eye were focused on him.

Can the student find anywhere, this year, a review or introduction which will suit his needs? Probably not in A. R. Reade's *Main Currents*,¹⁸ which begins with Kipling and ends with Mary Webb, is admirably lucid and sound, but too elementary and full of quotations for any but beginners. The most satisfying compilation is the revised and enlarged *Survey*¹⁹ which Harrap has published. The 110 pages of criticism are almost a masterpiece of concentration free from compression. Only a trained eye can detect the volume of contemporary observation and study condensed into these abbreviated generalizations. For instance, it is remarked of Bridges's *The Testament of Beauty*: 'in loose but subtle Alexandrines he attempted to synthesize a strongly Platonic reading of life with the increment of knowledge due to modern science'. Consciously or not, the authors of the *Survey* follow Fehr²⁰ in describing 'The Background', and assess the individual writers by the light of their artistic achievements and adhesion to the literary forms which seem to be best adapted to the present

¹⁸ *Main Currents in Modern Literature*, by A. R. Reade. Nicholson and Watson. pp. 223. 4s. 6d.

¹⁹ *Contemporary British Literature: a Critical Survey and 232 Author-Bibliographies*, by F. B. Millett. 3rd edition, revised and enlarged, by J. M. Manly and E. Rickert. Harrap. pp. xi+556. 10s. 6d.

²⁰ See *The Year's Work*, xv. 332.

stage of culture. They judge by a high standard; in fact their attitude is best implied by the pronouncement on English criticism. ‘There is little or no awareness of schools or the significance of creeds; instead, critical individualism, occasionally of a very high, but more frequently of a low and trivial order flourishes.’ The reader will gather that these Americans are perhaps too much inclined to take the tangled morass of book-production and to rule it out into an ordered territory. The struggling, thrusting adventurers are regimented into platoons and squadrons. We are not helped to feel their individual vitality, except by the picking out of their faults. This perhaps inevitable defect is unmistakable in the pregnant and lucid *Critical Survey*; even more so in their admirably documented *Contemporary British Bibliography* which might serve as a model for the next abridgement of the *D.N.B.*.

If the reader is disconcerted by modern disillusionment, he will find some answer in R. Shafer’s study of Paul Elmer More,²¹ or at any rate an idea of the depth and width of the problem. Shafer’s doctrine is much the same as Arnold’s. He holds that self-knowledge is different from scientific knowledge; that it consists in a progress of discoveries and cannot be valid unless accompanied by a sense of continuity, and the perception that an immense succession of great minds has travelled the same ground and has made the same or similar discoveries. ‘Human experience is the only absolute with which we are acquainted.’ Over all the conflict and interplay of thoughts there is an ‘inward check’ which the spirit can exercise—the proof of the soul’s reality. It is literature which reflects this inner reality, ‘opening up lines of communication with the past and establishing principles which have endless possibilities of further development and extension’. Such was the ideal which governed Paul More’s life. He stood for the true art and philosophy of criticism: the study and control of thought, the perception of our kinship with the past and our affinity to the future with its new knowledge and changed conditions. Shafer also tells us something of More’s career: his early academic life, his retire-

²¹ *Paul Elmer More and American Criticism*, by Robert Shafer. Yale Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. ix+325. 18s.

ment to Shelburne, his journalistic activities, above all, the gradual growth of his mind from his early experiments to *The Shelburne Essays* and then on to *The Greek Tradition*. All this philosophy and biography are to be found in the book, and much more, not, however, clearly and succinctly put forth, but embroiled with controversy and aspersions on contemporaries, and other such matters which do not concern us.

Another thinker whose work has contributed towards the preservation of culture is the late C. H. Herford, as we learn from Lascelles Abercrombie's funeral oration.²² It was Herford's genius to penetrate and grasp the international element in the literature he criticized, that is to say, not the influence of one author or another, but the wave of thought which possessed European culture at any given epoch and permeated works of art, otherwise so different in form and language. Thus Descartes was akin to Shakespeare, thanks to 'that infinitely complex, perpetually changing, yet perfectly continuous tradition, in which the genius of each particular nature lives and works in its own particular way'. Herford was not the creator of internationalism ; the idea was proclaimed by the German romantics, and continued through the nineteenth century ; but it is well to remember in what guise he revived the tradition and insisted on it.

The survey of books in this section might be concluded not by looking backward but forward, and we get at any rate a hint of future movements in *Poems of Tomorrow*.²³ The reader will form his own opinion of these 'young' verses, produced during the last five years, but whatever his final impression may be, he will agree with the editor that poetry should be an ever-changing pattern, playing on the sentiments with varying lights ; that novel thoughts need novel expressions ; that the best literature is often that which needs to be read more than once.

²² *Herford and International Literature*, by Lascelles Abercrombie. Manchester Univ. Press. pp. 21. 1s.

²³ *Poems of Tomorrow: an Anthology of Contemporary Verse chosen from 'The Listener'*, ed. by Janet Adam Smith. Chatto and Windus. pp. xii + 135. 5s.

In addition, the following articles have to be noted in the survey of 'The Nineteenth Century and After'.

In *Rev. Ang.-Amér.* (Aug.) *Sainte-Beuve et les poètes romantiques anglais*, by E. M. Phillips; (Feb.) *Les 'Juvenilia' de Jane Austen*, by Léonie Villard; *The Scholar Gipsy*, by E. K. Brown.

In *The Library* (June and Sept.) *The Early Nineteenth-Century Drama*, by R. C. Rhodes.

In *The Quarterly Review* (Oct.) *Robert Browning's 'Paracelsus'*, by F. S. Boas.

In *R.E.S.* (Jan.) *The Date of Coleridge's 'Kubla Khan'*, by Sir E. K. Chambers.

In *S. in Ph.* (Oct.) *Coleridge as Champion of Liberty*, by C. R. Sanders; (July) *A Probable Paracelsian Element in Shelley*, by E. Ebeling.

In *P.M.L.A.* (March) *The Relation of Coleridge's 'Ode on Dejection' to Wordsworth's 'Ode on Intimations of Immortality'*, by F. M. Smith; *Scott's . . . Use of the Supernatural*, by M. C. Boatright; *Lytton's Theories of Prose Fiction*, by H. H. Watts; (June) *The Significance of 'Lamia'*, by J. H. Roberts; (Sept.) *Carlyle and the German Philosophy Problem, 1826-7*, by H. Shine.

In *M.L.R.* (Jan.) *Prester John in Coleridge's 'Kubla Khan'*, by F. J. Warne.

In *P.Q.* (Oct.) *Unreconciled Opposites in Keats*, by R. D. Havens.

In *T.L.S.*, Jan. 17, *A Letter of Charlotte Brontë*, by M. L. Parrish; March 28, *Jane Austen's Two Conjectures*, by O. H. T. Dudley; Aug. 29, *Beddoes's German Poems*, by H. Bergholz; Oct. 10, *Arnold's 'Dover Beach'*, by C. B. Tinker.

In *Essays and Studies*, vol. xx, *The Writings of W. H. Hudson*, by R. H. Charles.

In *Essays by Divers Hands*, vol. xiv, *Plato and Ruskin*, by W. R. Inge; *The Plays of Mr. Noel Coward*, by St. John Ervine; *Mark Twain*, by Anthony Deane; *James Thomson and his 'City of Dreadful Night'*, by N. Hardy Wallis.

XIV

BIBLIOGRAPHICA

By HARRY SELLERS

THE outstanding bibliographical publication of the year is P. Simpson's *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries*,¹ an imposing collection of valuable documentary material on a little-known subject, set forth with wide and exact scholarship and a keen sense of literary values. The argumentative part is the first chapter, where Simpson proves with ease from contemporary references what has until recently been denied (notably by the editors of *The Cambridge Shakespeare* in relation to the printing of the First Folio), that authors did revise their proofs in the early days of printing, often attending in person while the press was at work. The rest of the book is a mass of illustrations, from archives and official and other sources printed and manuscript, of conditions in the printing-house during the period covered. In the chapter headed 'Early Proofs and Copy', full descriptions with facsimiles are given of extant examples of corrected proofs, and the many knotty problems which they present are discussed with penetrative sagacity. Chapters follow on 'Correctors of the Press' and 'The Oxford Press and its Correctors', packed with detail as to salaries and academic qualifications, records of individual correctors, printers' bills for books famous and otherwise, while the last chapter is enlivened by an amusing account of the long battle between Dr. Fell and Anthony à Wood over the printing of the Latin version of the *History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, in which Fell and his translator altered, inserted, or omitted passages at their pleasure. Simpson's copious citations from the 'learned' and other languages, joined to the meticulous accuracy of modern bibliography, must have added considerably to the labour of printing this tall and handsome volume, which has been achieved in the Oxford University Press's best manner.

¹ *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries*, by Percy Simpson. O.U.P. pp. vii + 251. £2 5s.

T. Besterman's *Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*² is produced uniformly with Simpson's work. Though the subject is not so novel nor so difficult, nor the wealth of learning lavished on it so great, yet there is no doubt that the early bibliographies, including such works as the voluminous publications of Conrad Gesner, Bale's *Summarium* and *Catalogus*, and Andrew Maunsell's *Catalogue of English printed Bookes*, were well worth listing and describing, and Besterman has done this adequately and lucidly. Systematic bibliography, it should be said, means the compilation of lists of books, and is distinguished from critical bibliography, the study of the make-up of particular volumes. Besterman's work is a *catalogue raisonné* of early book-lists, in various languages and on various subjects, from the auto-bibliography of Claudius Galenus, written in the second century, first printed in 1525, to the end of the seventeenth century. There is very little relief in the shape of biographical information from the lengthy enumeration of titles of books, and the excellent facsimiles which accompany the text will not be so practically useful as the chronological *List of Bibliographies printed to the end of the sixteenth century* which forms Part II, and the Index which concludes the whole.

R. A. Brewer's *The Delightful Diversion*³ is yet another cheery, breezy book from the States on the ever more and more popular subject of book-collecting. It has been written especially for the beginner with small knowledge and limited finances, and contains information of a quite elementary standard, but sound and practical, on a large range of subjects such as 'Identifying the First Edition', 'First and Second Issues', 'Presentation Copies', 'Association Copies', 'The Private Presses', 'English Illustrators', 'Fine Bindings', and 'Buying and Selling'. No one can quarrel with such maxims as that 'the two prime requisites of collectible things are rarity and desirability', or that 'selling at auction is always a gamble', and one is glad to hear that

² *The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*, by Theodore Besterman. O.U.P. pp. xi+81. £1 1s.

³ *The Delightful Diversion: the whys and wherefores of book collecting*, by Reginald Arthur Brewer. Illustrated. New York: Macmillan. pp. viii+320. 12s. 6d.

owing to the financial depression Americans have 'abandoned the empty, expensive pleasures of the easy-money days', so that 'good reading has again become a hobby in the American home'. Sweet are the uses of adversity. But owing to Brewer's preoccupation with modern, including contemporary American authors, the scholarly element in the book is slight.

Graham Pollard, in his Introduction to I. R. Brussel's *Anglo-American First Editions*,⁴ describes the book as 'the first step towards a bibliography of American literary piracy', and proceeds to explain, by means of a short and lucid sketch of the history of Copyright in England and America, how it came to pass that such important English books as *The Woman in White*, *Barry Lyndon*, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, and (in complete editions) *The Last Chronicle of Barset* and *The Confessions of an English Opium Eater* were first published in the United States. The novelty and surprising nature of the facts revealed may be readily supposed. Among other documents quoted is a careful and very business-like letter from Wilkie Collins to his publishers, and a half-humorous complaint by Thackeray about the reprinting of some of his early work. A large number of books by twenty-six nineteenth-century writers of high rank are listed in Brussel's bibliography, and sufficiently detailed descriptions are given of most of the books, with dates of their first publication in England whether as wholes or incomplete or in periodicals. Eight facsimiles are included.

The Second Part of R. A. Peddie's *Subject Index*⁵ consists of additional titles with many new subject-headings and covers an extra year. It is a bulky volume, larger than its predecessor, cross-references to which occupy a good deal of its space, so that it is necessary to use both volumes conjointly. Between them they contain 100,000 entries, a very remarkable number con-

⁴ *Anglo-American First Editions, 1826-1900. East to West. Describing first editions of English authors whose books were published in America before their publication in England.* By Isidore Rosenbaum Brussel. With an introduction by G. Pollard. Constable. pp. xvi + 170. £1 1s.

⁵ *Subject Index of Books published up to and including 1880, Second Series, A-Z, by Robert Alexander Peddie.* Grafton. pp. xv + 857. £10 10s.

sidering that they are the work of a single compiler, and they cannot fail to be of great usefulness to students. But the appearance of this very large collection of additions to the original volume justifies us in asking how much nearer we are to anything like exhaustiveness.

Among articles in *The Library*⁶ having reference to English literature the following may be mentioned here: Ruth Hughey in *The Harington Manuscript at Arundel Castle and related Documents* (Mar.) describes her recent discovery of a sixteenth-century anthology of verse, containing 324 poems, collected by John Harington and his son, Sir John. Among the poems, one-third of which have never been published, are many of those usually ascribed to Wyatt and Surrey, and others that appeared among the 'Uncertain Authors' in Tottel's *Miscellany*. The manuscript was used by Henry Harington in the eighteenth century for his editions of the *Nugae Antiquae*, and in 1814 by G. F. Nott for his edition of the *Songs and Sonnets*. Since that time it has been considered lost. Miss Hughey also describes two groups of related documents which are generally unknown.

Giles E. Dawson, in *An Early List of Elizabethan Plays* (Mar.), describes a common-place book by Henry Oxinden (1608–70) now in the possession of the Folger Library, which contains a list, compiled about 1665, of 123 plays which presumably formed part of Oxinden's library. Dawson gives the complete list of plays, sixty-two of which are dated and are mainly first editions earlier than 1610 (see above, p. 203). In *Shakespeare and the Reporters* (Mar.) W. Matthews devotes a long and detailed technical argument to proving that the bad quartos of *Richard III*, *Henry V*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, and *The Merry Wives* cannot be shorthand reports made by either Bright's system of 'Characterie' or Peter Bales's 'Brachygraphy', as certain scholars have recently suggested.

In an interesting paper on *Jonathan Swift and the Four Last Years of the Queen* (June) Harold Williams tells the surprising

⁶ *The Library (Transactions of the Bibliographical Society)*. New Ser. vol. xv, no. 4—vol. xvi, no. 3. O.U.P. 5s.

fortunes of the manuscript of Swift's work, publication of which was delayed, apparently for political reasons, from its completion in 1713 till 1758, more than twelve years after the author's death. The first edition, which was printed in London by Andrew Millar, and reprinted in Dublin by the Ewings, did not appear without serious disputes between Millar and George Faulkner, the Dublin publisher, as to ownership of the manuscript, which seems to have existed in several copies. Faulkner issued his own edition under a different title and from a different manuscript. Williams goes into the question as to which manuscripts were used by the two publishers and their relative reliability, and is able to dispose once for all of any doubt as to the authorship of the work by drawing attention to a manuscript in Windsor Castle which bears corrections in Swift's own handwriting.

In *The Early Nineteenth-Century Drama* (June and Sept.) the late R. Crompton Rhodes described a large collection of part-books and prompt-books which were in his possession, and which had been formerly in the library of the old Theatre Royal, Birmingham. They enabled him to make many additions and corrections, here set out with facsimiles, to the hand-list of Plays in Allardyce Nicoll's *History of Early Nineteenth-Century Drama*.

Gordon S. Haight in *The Sources of Quarles's Emblems* (Sept.) surveys the indebtedness of Quarles to two emblem books by Jesuit priests, *Pia Desideria*, 1629, and the *Typus mundi*, 1627, and to the 1563 edition of Thomas Hibernicus's *Flores Doctorum*, an anthology of the Fathers. The debt to the Jesuits concerns mainly the engravings, which Quarles had to have copied from their originals owing to the inability of English artists to invent suitable designs. The text of his poems is more original, but his extracts from the Fathers are practically all borrowed.

Gordon Crosse, in *Charles Jennens as Editor of Shakespeare* (Sept.), writes a brief but bright appreciation of this little-known eighteenth-century editor of *King Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Othello*, and *Julius Caesar*, whose eccentric vanity provoked ridicule which robbed him of the praise due to his indus-

try in 'faithfully collating the text line by line with the old as well as the modern editions' and his courage and energy in commencing his editorial labours at the age of seventy.

In *The Publication of Smollett's Complete History and Continuation* (Dec.) Lewis M. Knapp describes the methods by which Smollett's publishers made a financial success of his *History*, which included 'presenting' a fourth volume of the first edition to purchasers of the first three volumes and issuing the second edition in sixpenny weekly numbers. Knapp also accounts for the rarity of the fifth volume of the *Continuation*, 1765, by telling how it was bought up and destroyed by the court owing to its reference to George III's madness.

Edith C. Batho, in *Notes on the Bibliography of James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd* (Dec.), sets out the additions and corrections to her bibliography which have been accumulating since its publication in 1927. Finally, Arno L. Bader, in *Captain Marryat and the American Pirates* (Dec.), supplies an important chapter in the history of British and American publishing by relating Marryat's vigorous efforts to obtain a share in the profits of American editions of his works, efforts which included taking legal proceedings in a vain attempt to stop the pirating of *Snarleyyow*, and helping in various ways the cause of international copyright during his visit to the States from May 1837 to November 1838.

The fifteenth volume of the Modern Humanities Research Association's *Annual Bibliography*⁷ contains some minor changes in the arrangement and numbering of the sections, calculated to increase the practical usefulness of the work. The German contribution has been unusually large this year, and has helped to swell the total number of entries to 4,711.

A satisfactory number of interesting and important books have been acquired by the British Museum's Department of Printed Books during the year. In October the Friends of the

⁷ *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*. Vol. xv, ed. by Mary S. Serjeantson, assisted by Leslie N. Broughton. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes. pp. ix + 296. 7s. 6d.

National Libraries presented a copy of the first edition of Erasmus's *Moriae Encomium* (undated, but probably 1511), a small quarto volume of great rarity, which was published at Paris in two issues, with the printers' marks of Gilles de Gourmont and Jean Petit respectively. The present copy is of the first issue, and is the first of either issue to be possessed by a public library in this country. The book has a definite connexion with England: it was written by Erasmus while a guest at Sir Thomas More's house in Bucklersbury in 1509, and was seen through the press by Richard Croke, a young English student then in Paris, who afterwards taught Henry VIII Greek and became a well-known scholar.

Sir Leicester Harmsworth presented a copy of *Memorable Conceits of diuers noble and famous personages of Christendome of this our moderne time*, printed for James Shaw, London, 1602, of which only one other perfect copy is known. It is a translation of Gilles Corrozet's *Les Diuers Propos memorables des Nobles & illustres hommes de la Chrestienté*, 1556, a collection of moral tales and apophthegms which includes the story of the Jew, the debtor and the pound of flesh, incorporated in Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*. The publisher's preface dedicates the book to 'Maister Walter Rawleigh', the nine-year-old son of the famous Sir Walter.

Mr. W. A. Marsden, the Keeper of the Department, has presented a copy of the first edition of William Bullein's *A Dialogue both pleasaunt and pietifull, wherein is a goodly regimenter against the feuer pestilence*, printed by John Kingston, London, 1564, only one other copy known. This *Dialogue*, which was a very popular work in its day, and is referred to by Nashe in *Hauie with you to Saffron Walden*, is described by the *Dictionary of National Biography* as combining 'passages of exalted eloquence with humorous anecdotes and sharp strokes of satire'. The Department acquired by purchase in October a copy of Sir Isaac Newton's *De mundi systemate liber*, 1728, the first edition of the original form of the third book of the *Principia*; and *Summarie and short meditations touching sundry poyntes of Christian religion gathered by T. W.* [probably Thomas Wilcox],

printed for George Byshop, London, 1580, only one other copy recorded.

Finally, a number of rare books were presented at different times by Mr. Arthur Gimson, of which the following may be mentioned: *The Boke for a Justyce of the Peace*, W. Middilton, Londini, [1544], only one other perfect copy known; *Parvus Libellus (Carta Feodi)*, W. Mydylton, 1545, one other copy known; *The Maner of kepynge a Court Baron & a Lete*, W. Middilton, 1547, only known copy; *This is a true copy of the ordynaunce made in the tyme of the reygne of kynge Henry the vi. to be obserued in the Kynges Exchequier, by the offycers and clerkes of the same*, R. Redman, London, circa 1541, only recorded copy; *A true Reporte of the taking of the great towne and Castell of Polotzko, by the King of Polonia*, London, 1579, a very early news-tract, only known copy, with a fifteenth-century woodcut of London used to represent Polotzko; and Gervase Markham's *A Way to get Wealth: Containing the Sixe principall vocations or callings, in which everie good Husband or House-wife may lawfully imploy themselves*, N. Okes for J. Harrison, London, 1631, only two other perfect copies recorded.

The most important accession to the Department of Manuscripts in the sphere of English literature was a large collection of manuscripts of Samuel Butler, the author of *Erewhon*, presented by his literary executors, Dr. Geoffrey Keynes and Mr. Brian Hill. The Museum already possessed the manuscripts of *Erewhon*, *Erewhon Revisited*, and *The Way of All Flesh*. The present donation consists of (1) Butler's general correspondence, 1841–1902, bound in sixteen volumes; (2) Copies in Butler's hand of his correspondence with Miss E. M. A. Savage; (3) The autograph manuscript of *Life and Habit*, volume 2, intended for a sequel to *Life and Habit*, 1878; (4) Copy B. of the Note-Books, in six volumes; (5) The printed edition of the Note-Books, 1912, annotated by Festing Jones; (6) A volume of newspaper cuttings taken by Butler; and (7) Festing Jones's memoir of Butler, 1920, with annotations.

Another interesting accession was the papers of the Wyatt family, deposited in the Museum for the use of students by the

Earl of Romney. They are mostly in the hand of George Wyatt, grandson of the poet, Sir Thomas, but were put together by Richard Wyatt in 1727. They have been long known and occasionally used, but never completely published nor exhaustively studied. The most interesting part is a series of eight articles concerning the relations between Sir Thomas the poet and Anne Boleyn: these have been partly published. There are two copies of *The Life of the virtuous Christian and mourned Queene Anne Boleigne, An account of Anne Bullen's coming to Court*, and a large quantity of other historical material connected with the doings of the Wyatt family from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century.

It is difficult to select from the considerable number of old or rare printed books acquired by the Bodleian Library, but the following are perhaps most worthy of mention: Daniel's *Poeticall Essayes*, 1599; Defoe's *Complete English Tradesman*, 1727, second edition of vol. 1, first of vol. 2; Baxter's *Cure of Church-divisions*, 1670, *Christian Directory*, 1678, second edition, and *Treatise of Knowledge and Love compared*, 1689; John Maltbey's *A Grand-fathers Legacy, or Maltbey's morsels for mourners*, 1633, one other copy recorded; Bartholomew Parsons's *The Magistrates Charter examined*, 1616, one other copy recorded; Thomas Playfere's *The Sick-mans couch*, 1605, one other copy recorded; Fuller's *Antheologia, or the speech of flowers*, 1655, and *Ornithologie, or the speech of birds*, same date; J. Abernethy's *Christian and Heavenly Treatise containing physicke for the soule*, 1615, one other copy recorded; Coleridge's *Fall of Robespierre*, Cambridge, 1794; Dryden's *Prologue spoken at Mithridates*, 1681, and *Prologue to the Duke of Guise*, 1683; T. Heyrick's *Miscellany Poems*, Cambridge, 1691; Milton's *Brief History of Moscovia*, 1682; Pope's *Essay on Criticism*, 1711; Prior's *Erle Robert's Mice*, 1712, *The Dove*, 1717, and *The Turtle and the Sparrow*, 1723; Scott's *Waverley*, Edinburgh, 1814, and *Vision of Don Roderick*, Edinburgh, 1811, author's copy; Colley Cibber's *The Rival Fools*, 1709; J. Dennis's *Remarks on Mr. Pope's Rape of the Lock*, 1728; John Hughes's *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1735; Robert Dodsley's *Rex et Pontifex*, 1745; W. Guild's *Ignis fatuus, or the elf-fire of Purgatorie*, 1625, three other copies

known ; William Perkins's *Treatise of Mans Imaginations*, 1607, one other copy recorded ; and John Tutchin's *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1685.

The most interesting manuscript accession of the year consists of ten autograph letters of Philip Bliss, the editor of Wood's *Athenae*, whose life and works were the subject of a masterly study by S. Gibson and C. J. Hindle published in 1933 and noticed in vol. xiv of *The Year's Work*. These letters, which are addressed to various correspondents and illustrate Bliss's literary activities—including his editorship of the *Oxford Herald*, which he undertook in 1835 in order to save the paper 'from falling into the hands of the *Low Radicals*'—range in date from December 1813 to May 1857. They were recently acquired by Mr. J. P. R. Lyell and handed over to the Bodleian. Another manuscript which should be mentioned is a collection of letters of Mary Russell Mitford to Serjeant Talfourd, 1826–36.

The National Library of Scotland has added to its collections of printed books a creditable number of works written by Scotsmen, printed in Scotland, or dealing with Scottish matters, with some others. The following may be named here : R. A. Scott Macfie presented Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun's *A Discourse of Government with relation to Militia's*, Edinburgh, 1698, *Two Discourses concerning the Affairs of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1698, and *Discorso delle Cose di Spagna*, Napoli, 1698 ; William Ruff presented Sir Walter Scott's *Poetical Works*, eight volumes, Edinburgh, 1822 ; and R. A. Hellewell *Catulli, Tibulli et Propertii Opera*, printed by Baskerville, Birmingham, 1772. Purchases include George Buchanan's *Ane Admonition Direct to the trew Lordis mantenaris of the Kingis Graces Authoritie*, R. Lekprevik, Striviling, 1571 ; Andrew Logie's *Cum Bono Deo. Raine from the Clouds vpon a Choicke Angel*, E. Raban, Aberdeen, 1624 ; John Kennedie's *Historie of Calanthrop and Lucilla*, I. Wreittoun, Edinburgh, 1626, two other copies recorded ; *The Answer of the Convention of the Estates*, E. Tyler, Edinburgh, 1643 ; *Articles and Ordinances of Warre*, E. Tyler, Edinburgh, 1643 ; *The True Intelligence concerning the Taking of New-Castle*, E. Tyler, Edinburgh, 1644 ; Thomas Shepheard's *The Sound Beleever*, G.

Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1658; *Laws & Articles of War*, E. Tyler, Edinburgh, 1667; Dryden's *The Medall*, Edinburgh, 1682; Sir George Mackenzie's *Jus Regium*, London, 1684; Jonas Philologus's *Dialogi aliquot Lepidi ac Festivi*, G. Mosman, Edinburgh, 1692; James Wallace's *Description of the Isles of Orkney*, J. Reid, Edinburgh, 1693; Thomas Tenison's *Sermon preached at the Funeral of Queen Mary*, Heirs of A. Anderson, Edinburgh, 1695; Sir David Lindsay's *Works*, Heirs and Successors of A. Anderson, Edinburgh, 1709, and 1716; Allan Ramsay's *Scots Songs*, Edinburgh, 1719, second edition; John Morgan's *Poem on the Taylor Craft*, R. Brown, Edinburgh, 1733; Hume's *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*, London, 1748; the *Νεφέλαι* of Aristophanes printed by R. and A. Foulis, Glasgow, 1755; and a Spanish translation of Scott's *Antiquary*, *El Anticuario*, in five volumes, Barcelona, 1834. The most important manuscript accession was the original manuscript of *The Heart of Midlothian*, presented by Miss J. G. C. Topham of Middleham House, Yorkshire. It had come into the possession of her great-grandfather, Alexander Cowan, by gift from the Creditors of Archibald Constable & Co.

The year has been a somewhat uneventful one in the book-market. On 5 March a set of the four Shakespeare Folios, the property of the Massachusetts General Hospital, was sold at Sotheby's to W. H. Robinson of Pall Mall for £3,100, the comparatively low price being accounted for by the fact that the copy of the First Folio lacked both the title-page and leaf of verses, and had six leaves supplied from a slightly smaller copy. Leigh Hunt's copy of the Second Folio, 1632, realized £165 in July, and a copy of the Third Folio, second issue, 1664—the first issue to contain the seven additional (and apocryphal) plays—£600 in August.

The first collected edition of Chaucer's *Workes*, 1532, printed by Thomas Godfray, edited by W. Thynne, sold for £365 in July. Other sixteenth-century books which changed hands during the year included North's *Plutarch*, 1579, the rare first issue of the first edition, £90; Churchyard's *Worthines of Wales*, 1587, £58; Whetstone's *English Myrror*, 1586, £30; Hakluyt's *Principall*

Nauigations, voiajes and discoueries of the English nation, 1599–1600, 3 volumes, second edition, second issue of vol. i, £41; Sidney's *Apologie for Poetrie*, 1595, £120; Reginald Scot's *Discouerie of Witchcraft*, 1584, £20; Florio's *Firste Fruites*, 1578, and *Second Frutes*, 1591, together £47; Spenser's *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, 1595, £65, and *Complaints*, 1591, £72; and Thomas Watson's *Amintae Gaudia*, 1592, £40.

At the sale in November of Lieut.-Colonel W. Keith Rollo's collection of books relating to angling, a set of early editions of Walton's *Compleat Angler* sold as follows: a fine copy of the first edition, 1653, in a modern binding, £510; second edition, 1655, £140; third edition, 1661, with 1664 title-page, £40; fourth edition, 1668, £36; fifth edition, 1676, £19. Another copy of the second edition, with the title in facsimile, fetched £10 10s. in March.

Other seventeenth-century books sold during the year included Cervantes's *History of Don-Quichote*, 1620, Shelton's translation, second edition of vol. 1, first of vol. 2, £26; Milton's *Of Education*, 1644, only five other copies recorded, £122, Εἰκονολάστης, 1649, £5, *History of Britain*, 1670, £4, and *Paradise Lost*, 1667, first edition, second title-page, with *Paradise Regain'd*, 1671, together £145; William Browne's *The Shepheards Pipe*, 1614, £7 5s.; Samuel Daniel's *Certaine Small Poems lately printed*, 1605, £9 10s., *Certaine Small Workes heretofore divulged*, 1611, £3, and *Works newly augmented*, second issue, 1602, £2 18s.

Eighteenth-century works worth mentioning were Defoe's *Fortunate Mistress (Roxana)*, 1724, £75, *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, 1719, with folding map and eleven pages of advertisements at the end, £31, and *Memoirs of a Cavalier*, 1720, £4 10s.; Goldsmith's *Retaliation*, 1774, £64; Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, 1714, first issue, £14 10s.; Gay's *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1720, £4 4s.; Beckford's *Thoughts on Hunting*, 1781, £20; Fanny Burney's *Cecilia*, 1782, £9 15s.; Fielding's *Tom Jones*, 1749, six volumes, £60; Pope's *Dunciad*, Dublin, 1728, the first Dublin edition and the first edition to bear Pope's name, £56; Smollett's *Roderick Random*, 1748, £19 10s., *Peregrine*

Pickle, 1751, £16, and *Count Fathom*, 1753, £22; the Kilmarnock edition of Burns's *Poems chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*, 1786, lacking title-page and otherwise imperfect, £72; Johnson's *Prince of Abissinia (Rasselas)*, 1759, uncut, in original wrappers, £305; Thomson and Mallet's masque *Alfred*, in which 'Rule Britannia' first appeared, second edition, 1751, £41; Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, 1768, £138; Mrs. Radcliffe's *The Italian*, 1797, three volumes, £1 15s.; Swift's *Complete Collection of Genteel and Ingenious Conversation*, 1738, £1 2s.; Somerville's *The Chace*, 1735, £4; White's *Selborne*, 1789, £12 10s.; and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, 1776–88, six volumes, £21.

Among works of the period of the Romantic Revival the highest price was paid for a copy of Shelley's *Queen Mab*, 1813, uncut, in the original boards without label, which sold for £500 at Sotheby's in April. Other works of the period included Shelley's *Rosalind and Helen*, 1819, £17, *Laon and Cythna*, 1818, with blank leaf b 2 after the title and leaf of errata at the end, original boards, £55, and *Adonais*, 1821, text cut round and inlaid, £21; Wordsworth's *Poems*, 1807, two volumes, £5 10s., *Waggoner*, 1819, £2, *Yarrow Revisited*, 1835, £1 12s., and *Grace Darling*, Carlisle, 1843, two leaves, signed at the end by the author, unbound, £14; Coleridge's *Christabel*, 1816, wrapper, £45; Keats's *Lamia*, 1820, lacking half-title, rebound, £7, *Endymion*, 1818, rebound, £20 10s., and another copy in modern morocco, £16; Lamb's *Adventures of Ulysses*, 1808, £5 10s.; Byron's *Childe Harold*, Cantos III and IV, 1816–18, £2; Samuel Rogers's *Italy*, 1823–8, presentation copy with Wordsworth's signature, £2; Hazlitt's *Lectures on the English Poets*, 1818, £1; and Southey's *Joan of Arc*, Bristol, 1796, presentation copy to Anna Seward from the Ladies of Llangollen, £1 4s., and *Life of Nelson*, 1813, two volumes, £1 8s.

Among nineteenth-century novelists Dickens and Surtees as usual took up a great deal of room, though the most sensational price was the £165 paid at Hodgson's on 30 October for a copy of the first edition of Mrs. Henry Wood's *East Lynne*, 1861, three volumes in the original purple cloth gilt, inscribed 'Ellen Mary Wood from Mamma'. A copy of Dickens's *Pickwick Papers*, 1836–7, original nineteen to twenty parts, wanting adver-

tisements, brought £22, and another copy, bound, £14 10s.; *Nicholas Nickleby*, 1838–9, wrappers, brought £10 10s., *A Christmas Carol*, 1843, coloured illustrations by Leech, title in red and blue, £5, *Great Expectations*, 1861, three volumes, wanting the advertisements, £2 4s., *Dombey and Son*, 1848, £1 7s. 6d., *Little Dorrit*, 1857, with the original wrappers bound in, £1 12s. 6d., *Martin Chuzzlewit*, 1844, £1 5s., and *The Uncommercial Traveller*, 1861, with author's signature on title, £14 10s. Surtees's *Analysis of the Hunting Field*, 1846, coloured plates by Alken, fetched £16, *Mr. Facey Romford's Hounds*, 1865, coloured plates by Leech and H. K. Browne, £2 8s., *Handley Cross*, 1854, seventeen parts, original wrapper, £33, *Hawbuck Grange*, 1847, plates by Phiz, £4 4s., and *Hillingdon Hall*, 1845, three volumes, £44. Other novels included Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*, 1848, £2 5s., *Rebecca and Rowena*, 1850, £1 5s., *Second Funeral of Napoleon*, 1841, £24, *Henry Esmond*, 1852, three volumes, £1 10s., and *The Newcomes*, 1855, two volumes, £1 7s. 6d.; Scott's *The Abbot*, 1820, £1; Stevenson's *Kidnapped*, 1886, £2 5s., *New Arabian Nights*, 1882, £5 5s., *Prince Otto*, 1885, £4 5s., and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, 1886, £4 10s.; Gissing's *Workers in the Dawn*, 1880, £74; Jane Austen's *Emma*, 1816, three volumes with the half-titles, £32; Mrs. Gaskell's *Cranford*, 1853, £21, and *North and South*, 1855, two volumes, original cloth, £2; Trollope's *Small House at Allington*, 1864, two volumes, original cloth, uncut, £3 10s.; Butler's *Erewhon*, 1872, original cloth, uncut, £4, and *Erewhon Revisited*, 1901, autographed presentation copy, £4; and Samuel Lover's *Handy Andy*, 1842, £1 11s.

Among poetical works of the period the following seem most worth mentioning: Browning's *Ring and the Book*, 1868–9, author's presentation copy to Matthew Arnold, £43, *Men and Women*, 1855, two volumes, £2, and *Strafford*, 1837, £2 16s.; Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, 1850, Anna Sewell's copy with her signature, £2 10s.; Matthew Arnold's *Strayed Reveller*, 1849, initialled by the author, £9, *Empedocles on Etna*, 1852, £2 5s., and *Poems*, second edition, 1854, with author's manuscript notes, £48; Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*, Brooklyn, 1855, the scarce first edition containing only twelve poems, £28; George

Moore's *Pagan Poems*, 1881, with author's initials on title, £20; Stevenson's *Child's Garden of Verses*, 1885, £12; Swinburne's *Atalanta in Calydon*, 1865, uncut, £1 2s., and *Poems and Ballads*, 1866, £5; the Brontë sisters' *Poems*, 1846, £5; and Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*, 1842, £2 16s.

INDEX

- Abbott, C. C., *The Letters of G. M. Hopkins to Robert Bridges*, ed. by, 331–2; *The Correspondence of G. M. Hopkins and R. W. Dixon*, ed. by, 332.
- Abercrombie, L., *Hertford and International Literature*, 346.
- Abers, Jacob H., *Scientific Rationalism in the 17th century*, 263.
- [Accessions to the Bodleian], 356–7.
- [Accessions to the British Museum], 354–6.
- [Accessions to the National Library of Scotland], 357–8.
- Adriès, André, *Shakespeare et la folie*, 183.
- Aiken, Pauline, *Vincent of Beauvais and Dame Pertelote*, 112.
- Alexander, Calvert, *The Catholic Literary Revival*, 7–8.
- Alexander, Peter, on a ‘Pocket Shakespeare’, 186.
- Allen, Don Cameron, *A Note on 16th-century Vernacular English Language*, 53–4; *Hotspur's Earthquake*, 194–5; ‘*The Anatomie of Absurditie* . . .’, 243.
- Allen, Hope Emily, *Influence of Superstition on Vocabulary . . .* 48; *The Torkington Chartulary*, 148; *The Three Daughters of Deorman*, 148; *Dicing Fly and The Alchemist*, 212–13.
- Allen, Ned Bliss, *The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies*, 269–70.
- Allen, R. J., *Two Wycherley Letters*, 269.
- Allhusen, E. L., *A Swift Epitaph*, 316.
- Anders, Erika, see under Stahl, E. L., 198.
- Anderson, Paul B., *Buckingham's Chemist*, 269.
- Anonymous, *Ghost Technique in Shakespeare*, 196.
- Anonymous, ‘*Hamlet*: A Query’, 190–1.
- Arbuthnot, M.D., *John*, 294.
- Atkins, S. H., ‘*Fortunio and Raymundus*’, 241; *A Fig for Momus*, 245; *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey*, ed. by, 247.
- Atkinson, Dorothy F., *References to Chaucer; Chaucer Allusions*, 117.
- Auden, W. H., *Psychology and Art*, 10; with John Garrett, *The Poet's Tongue*, 26–7.
- Ault, Norman, *Pope's Own Miscellany*, 286–7; on Pope's editorship, 287; *Pope's Lost Sermon on Glass-Bottles*, 316.
- Avery, E. L., *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, 315.
- B., C. W., *Pope's Lost Sermon on Glass-Bottles*, 316.
- Bader, A. L., *The Modena Troupe in England*, 268–9.
- Baescke, Anna, *Das Schauspiel der engl. Komödianten in Deutschland*, 224.
- Baker, E. A., *The History of the English Novel . . . Edgeworth, Austen, Scott*, 326–7.
- Baker, Howard, *Ghosts and Guides: Kyd's 'Spanish Tragedy' and the Medieval Tragedy*, 209.
- Baker, J. E., *The Philosophy of Hamlet*, 185.
- Bald, R. C., *A MS. Work by Sir George Buc*, 247.
- Baldwin, T. W., *A Note upon William Shakespeare's Use of Pliny*, 196.
- Banks, T. H., *Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella'* Reconsidered, 233.
- Barnouw, A. J., *How English was taught in Jan van Hout's Leyden*, 55; on the term ‘Dutch’, 62; *Rasselus in Dutch*, 316.
- Bartlett, Adeline C., *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 71–3.
- Bartlett, Henrietta C., *First Editions of Shakespeare's Quartos*, 187.
- Barton, Mary N., see under Kennedy, V. W., 320.
- Baskerville, C. R., *Richard Mulcaster*, 242.
- Batho, Edith C., *Notes on the Bibliography of James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd*, 353.
- Baugh, A. C., *American Bibliography for 1935*, 30; *Chronology of French loan-words in English*, 45; *A History of the English Language*, 50–1.
- Beattie, Lester M., *John Arbuthnot, Mathematician and Satirist*, 292–4.
- Beck, Egerton, *Saint Thomas More and the Law*, 164.
- Beckingham, C. G., ‘*Othello*’ and ‘*Revenge for Honour*’, 191.
- Begg, Edleen, *Shakespeare's Debt to Hall and Holinshed in 'Richard III'*, 194.

- Behr, U., *Wortkontamination in der neuenglischen Schriftsprache*, 46.
- Belloc, Hilaire, *Milton*, 252.
- Bennett, Josephine W., *Spenser's 'Foure Hymnes': Addenda*, 240.
- Bense, J. F., *A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary*, 38-9.
- Bensly, Edward, *Terentius Christianus*, 173.
- Berendsohn, W. A., *Zur Vorgeschichte des Beowulf*, 79.
- Beresford, J., *Passages from Woodforde's Diary of a Country Parson*, 290.
- Bergen, Henry, *Lydgate's Troy Book, Part IV*, ed. by, 118-19.
- Bergholz, H., *Beddoes's German Poems*, 347.
- Besterman, Theodore, *The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*, 349.
- Bethurum, Dorothy, *The Connection of the Katherine Group with O.E. Prose*, 149.
- Bhattacherjee, Mohinimohan, *Platonic Ideas in Spenser*, 236.
- Blackmur, R. P., *The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces by Henry James*, ... 335-6.
- Blackwell, Basil, *Provincial Bookselling*, 24.
- Bloch, Bernard, *Interviewing for the Linguistic Atlas*, 63.
- Bloomfield, Leonard, *Language*, 60; *The Stressed Vowels of American English*, 64.
- Blunden, Edmund, *Edward Gibbon and his Age*, 299-300; *An Essay by Collins*, 316.
- Boarman, J. C., and Harte, J. L., with character sketches by M. H. Boarman, *Boz: an Intimate Biography of Charles Dickens*, 329-30.
- Boas, F. S., *A Lost and Found Volume of MS. Plays*, 204; *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, ed. by, 261; *Robert Browning's 'Paracelsus'*, 347.
- Boas, Guy, *The New Eversley Shakespeare*, ed. by, 195.
- Boatright, M. C., *Use of the Supernatural*, 347.
- Bodkin, Maud, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*, 14-15.
- Bödtker, A. Trampe, *Arthur Brooke and his Poem*, 192.
- Bois, A. E. Du, on *Beowulf 1107* and 2577, 81-2; on *Beowulf 489-490*, 83.
- Bond, R. Warwick, *On Six Plays in 'Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679'*, 213-14.
- Bongartz, Josef, *Die deutsche Mundartforschung in ihrer Bedeutung für den englischen Unterricht*, 51.
- [Book-Sales], 358-62.
- Borgman, A. S., *The Life and Death of William Mountfort*, 267-8.
- Bosanquet, Eustace F., *An Almanack and Prognostication for the Year 1598*, ed. by, 227-8.
- Botting, R. B., *Composition of the 'Shepheardes Calender'*, 239-40.
- Bowers, F. J., *A History of Elizabethan Revengeful Tragedy*, 224.
- Boyce, Benjamin, *A Restoration 'Improvement' of T. Dekker*, 280.
- Bradbrook, M. C., *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, 199-200.
- Braddy, Haldeen, on Chaucer's acct. of 'Petro' of Cyprus, 111.
- Bradner, Leicester, *The Latin Translations of Spenser's 'Shepheardes Calender'*, 240.
- Brandl, Alois, *Zur Quelle des 'Macbeth'*, 192.
- Braun, Karl Otto, *Die Szenenentführung in den Shakespeare'schen Historien. Ein Vergleich mit Holinshead und Hall*, 194.
- Brentano, Mary Theresa, *Relationship of the Latin *Facetus* Literature to the Medieval English Courtesy Poems*, 157.
- Brewer, R. A., *The Delightful Diversions: the whys and wherefores of book collecting*, 349-50.
- Brill, M. C., *Milton and Ovid*, 263.
- Brittin, Norman A., on *Discours contre Machiavel* [Simon Patericke], 246-7. See also Butler, K. T., 247.
- Broadus, E. K., *Polonius*, 190.
- Brock, J. H. E., *The Dramatic Purpose of 'Hamlet'*, 176-8.
- Bronson, Bertrand H., *Chaucer's House of Fame* . . . , 95-6; *In Appreciation of Chaucer's Parliament of Foules*, 96-7.
- Brooke, Iris, *English Costumes of the Later Middle Ages* . . . , 157.
- Brooks, Jnr., Cleanth, *The Relation of the Alabama-Georgia Dialects, to the Provincial Dialects of Great Britain*, 62-3.
- Brooks, E. St. John, on *Peter Idley*, and the family of Drayton, 156.
- Brooks, H., *Some Notes on Dryden, Cowley and Shadwell*, 269; *Attributions to Rochester*, 273; *When did Dryden write 'Mac Flecknoe'? . . .*, 271; *Attributions to Rochester*, 273.
- Brooks, J. L., *Alexander Brome* . . . , 224.

- Brown, Beatrice Daw, *Exemplum Materials underlying 'Macbeth'*, 192.
- Brown, Carleton, *Chaucer's 'Wretched Engendring'*, 92-4; the Bibliography of, 121; *The Pardonner's Tale*, ed. by, 101, 112-13.
- Brown, E. K., *The Scholar Gipsy*, 347.
- Brown, Huntingdon, *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 53.
- Brunner, Karl, *Mittelenglische Marienstunden*, 133; *Zwei Gedichte aus der Handschrift*, 133-4; *Mittelengl. Todesgedichte*, 135; *Ein typisches Bußgedicht aus dem fünfzehnten J^t.*, 136.
- Brussel, Isidore Rosenbaum, *Anglo-American First Editions, 1826-1900, East to West . . . of English authors . . . published in America before . . . England*. With an introduction by G. Pollard, 350.
- Bryant, Arthur, *Samuel Pepys: The Years of Peril*, 274-5; *The Letters, Speeches and Declarations of King Charles II*, ed. by, 279.
- Buchan, John, *The Compleat Angler* [re-issued], 263.
- Buck, Katherine M., on parallels to the legend of *Y Gwr Blewog*, 81.
- Budd, F. E., *Shakespeare, Chaucer and Harsnett*, 191-2.
- Bueno, Lillian de la Torre, *Was Ambrose Philips a Ballad Editor?*, 314.
- Bühler, Karl, *Sprachtheorie*, . . ., 36-7.
- Bullocke, J. G., *Tomlinson Papers*, 290.
- Bullough, G., 'The Murder of Gonzago': A Probable Source for 'Hamlet', 190.
- Burns, Robert, *Burns Chronicle and Club Directory* (has articles *Letters of and Concerning R. Burns, Correspondence of John Syme and Alexander Cunningham, Burns's Last Years, 'The Lochlie Litigation and the Sequestration of William Burnes', and 'Louisa Fontenelle, actress.'*) 313. See also 315.
- Bush, D., *The Personal Note in Tennyson's Classical Poems*, 329.
- Butler, Kathleen T., on *Discours contre Machiavel*, 246-7, see under Brittin, N. A., 246-7.
- Bütow, Hans, *Das alteng. Traumgesicht vom Kreuz*, ed. by, 78-9.
- Byrne, M. St. Clare, *The Mother of Francis Bacon*, 248.
- Byrom, H. J., *Some Lawsuits of Nicholas Udall*, 173.
- Cain, H. E., Spenser's 'Shield of Faith', 238.
- Cairncross, Andrew S., *The Date of 'Othello'*, 191.
- Camden, Jr., C., *The Physiognomy of Thopas*, 108.
- Cameron, Kenneth W., *Coverdale's Bible of 1535 and the Theory of Translation*, 168.
- Campbell, Lily B., *The Christian Muse*, 250.
- Campbell, Mrs. O. W., on a 'Pocket Shakespeare', 186.
- Cargill, Oscar, *The Langland Myth*, 129-30.
- Carswell, Catharine, *Lollius myn Autour*, 99.
- Carter, John, on *Urne-Buriall's* corrections in autograph, 263.
- Case, A. E., *Pope, Addison, and the 'Atticus' lines*, 315.
- Cassidy, F. G., *A Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in Beowulf (745b-749)*, 83.
- Cecil, Lord David, see under Williams, Charles, 26; Jane Austen, 325-6.
- Celenza, Giulia, see under Piccoli, R., 195.
- Chambers, Sir E. K., on the Latin Vision of the Monk of Evesham, 150; see under Davies C., 150; *The Date of Coleridge's Kubla Khan*, 347.
- Chambers, R. W., *Thomas More*, 161-3.
- Chambrun, C. Longworth de, with Preface by André Maurois, *My Shakespeare, Rise! Recollections of John Lacy . . .*, 197.
- Chapman, George, character conventions in comedy, 215-16; relation to the psychology and physiology of his day, 216.
- Chappell, Edwin, *The Tangier Papers of S. Pepys*, . . ., ed. by, 275; *Pepys and the Huguenots*, 277; *Pepysiana*, 277.
- Chappell, Louis W., *Another 'Canterbury Tale'*, 117.
- Charles, R. H., *The Writings of W. H. Hudson*, 347.
- Charlton, H. B., *Falstaff*, 185.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, life, 114-17, use of rhetoric, 91-2; additions to the canon?, 92-4; *Hous of Fame*, 94-6; *Parlement of Foules*, 96-7; *T. and C.*, 97-9; *C. T.s*, 99-105; Source of 'Melibœus' 109-10; *Monk's Tale*, 110-11; *Pardonner's Tale*, 112-14; *Bibliography*, 117.
- Chester, Allan Griffith, *Thomas Churchyard's Pension of 20d.*, 233.

- Child, Harold, *The Shakespearian Productions of John Philip Kemble*, 196.
- Christian, Mildred G., *Middleton's Acquaintance with the 'Merrie Conceited Jests of George Peele'*, 217.
- Clark, Cumberland, *Falstaff and his Friends*, 185.
- Clark, G. H., *The Dutch Influence on the English Vocabulary*, 45.
- Clark, W. S., *Milton and the Villa Diodati*, 256.
- Coffman, George R., *Note on the Miller's Prologue*, 107.
- Coghill, Nevill, *Two Notes on Piers Plowman*, 131-2.
- Coleridge, S. T., his life, and personality, 319-21; bibliography, 321.
- Collins, D. C., *Battle of Nieuport, 1600: Two News Pamphlets and a Ballad*, ed. by, 228.
- Collinson, W. E., see under Priebisch, R., 64.
- Collis, J. S., *William Cobbett*, 314.
- Cook, Davidson, *Popular Dramatic Works of W. Shakespeare*, 188; *Louisa Fontenelle*, actress, 313.
- Cook, D., see under Grierson, H. J. C., 324.
- Cookson, George, *Essays and Studies*, ed. by, 24.
- Coulton, G. G., *The Faith of Sir Thomas More*, 165.
- Cowling, G. H., *The Outline of English Verse*, ed. by, 27-8.
- Craig, Hardin, *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume . . .*, ed. by, 184-5, 216. Contributions by, Harold R. Walley, Hubertis Cummings, J. E. Baker, Hardin Craig, Charles W. Kennedy.
- Craigie, Sir W. A., *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue . . .*, 38.
- Crankshaw, Edward, *Music*, 11.
- Crawford, O. G. S., *Arthur and his Battles*, 141.
- Cremer, R. W. Ketton, *Thomas Gray*, 296.
- Cross, F. L., see under More, P. E., 251.
- Crosse, Gordon, *Charles Jennens as Editor of Shakespeare*, 188, 352-3.
- Crow, Martin Michael, *Corrections in the Paris MS. of Chaucer's C. Tales*, 103-4.
- Crundell, H. W., *The Rugged Pyrrhus and Hamlet*, 190; on 'Too too sullied Flesh', 190; *A Note on 'King Lear'*, 192; *Shakespeare, Lylly and Aesop*, 196.
- Cruse, Amy, *The Victorians and their Books*, 327.
- Cummings, Hubertis, *For Shakespeare's Hamlet*, 185.
- Curme, George O., *Parts of Speech and Accidence*, 31-2.
- Curry, W. C., *Macbeth's Changing Character*, 192; *Sacerdotal Science in . . . 'The Tempest'*, 193.
- Curtis, Lewis Perry, *Letters of Laurence Sterne*, ed. by, 283-4; *Forged Letters of Laurence Sterne*, 315.
- Daglish, E. F., *Out-of-Doors with Richard Jefferies*, ed. by, 337.
- Daniels, R. Balfour, *Rhetoric in Gower's To King Henry IV*, in *Praise of Peace*, 118.
- Davenport, A., *John Weever's 'Epigrams' and the Hall-Marston Quarrel*, 241.
- David, Richard, *The Janus of Poets: . . . Dramatic Value of Shakespeare's Poetry . . .*, 179-80.
- Davies, Constance, *Beowulf's Fight with Grendel*, 81; *The Revelation of the Monk of Evesham*, 150; see under Chambers, Sir E. K., 150.
- Davis, H., *Samuel Butler*: 1835-1902, 334.
- Davis, Herbert, *The Drapier's Letters . . .*, 285-6.
- Dawson, Giles E., *An Early List of Elizabethan Plays*, 203-4, 351.
- Deane, C. V., *Aspects of 18th Century Nature Poetry*, 309-10.
- Dekker, A., *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden*, 54-5.
- Delafield, E. M., *The Brontës: . . . by their Contemporaries . . .* Introduction by, 328.
- Delattre, Floris, *L'Illusion émotionnelle dans Shakespeare*, 182; *Sur Ben Jonson*, 212.
- Deutschbein, Max, *Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von Roald bei Shakespeare*, 49, 195; *Der rhythmische Charakter der neuenglischen Bibelübersetzung von 1611*, 56.
- D'Evelyn Charlotte, *Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son*, ed. by, 155-6.
- Dexter, W., *Mr. and Mrs. Charles Dickens. His Letters to Her, with a Foreword by their daughter Kate Perugini and Notes, Appendices, &c.*, 330-1.
- Dickins, Bruce, *Latin Additions to Place- and Parish-names of England and Wales*, 59-60; *Kleinere Mitteilungen*, 85; *Seynd Bacoun*, 112; on *The Flying of Dunbar and Kennedy*,

- 128; Worcester *Fragments of the M.E. Secular Lyric*, 136; *The Rhyme-Schemes in MS. Douce 302*, 53 and 54, 138; *Havelock* 64-6, 138; on *Mauris and his felowes*, 150.
- Dike, Edwin Berck, *Obsolete English Words* . . . , 55.
- Dobson, E. J. on T. S. Eliot, 342.
- Dodds, M. H., *A Lost Elizabethan Play about Palamedes*, 222.
- Donner, H. W., *Thomas Lovell Beddoes: the Making of a Poet*, 323-4; *The Browning Box: or the Life and Works of T. L. Beddoes . . . in Letters by his Friends* . . . , 324.
- Doran, Madeleine, *The Quarto of 'King Lear' and Bright's Shorthand*, 187; — and Greg, W. W., *If You know not Me, You Know Nobody*, Parts I and II, ed. by, 218-19.
- Doren, Carl van, *What is American Literature?*, 9-10.
- Dorow, K.-G., *Die Beobachtungen des Sprachmeisters James Elphinston über die schottische Mundart*, 51-2.
- Doyle-Davidson, W. A. G., *The Earlier English Works of Sir Thomas More*, 165.
- Draper, John W., *Ophelia and Laertes*, 183; *Lord Chamberlain Polonius*, 183; *Hamlet's Schoolfellows*, 183; *Shakespeare's Italianate Courtier*, 183; *Usury in 'The M. of V.'*, 183-4.
- Drennon, Herbert, *Newtonianism in James Thomson's Poetry*, 314.
- Dryden, John, comedies, 269-70; . . . as *Historiographer-Royal*, 271; religion, 271.
- Dudley, O. H. T., *Jane Austen's Two Conjectures*, 347.
- Durling, Dwight L., *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry*, 310.
- Ebeling, E., *A Probable Paracelsian Element in Shelley*, 347.
- Eccles, Mark, *Marlowe in Kentish Tradition*, 206-7.
- Eckhardt, E., *Robert Davenport's Lustspiel, 'A New Trick to Cheat the Devil'*, 222.
- Edgar, Irving I., *Shakespeare's Psychopathological Knowledge* . . . , 183; *Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge* . . . , 183.
- Edwards, H. L. R., *John Skelton: A Genealogical Study*, 168; *Chapman and Florio*, 244.
- Egbert, Donald Drew, on *The Tewkesbury Psalter*, 159.
- Eglinton, John, *Irish Literary Portraits*, 339.
- Eichler, Albert, *Zu Chaucer, 'Canterbury Tales'*, *General Prologue*, 106.
- Ekwall, Eilert, *Some Notes on English Place-names containing the names of heathen deities*, 59.
- Eliason, Norman E., on *Wulflido in Beowulf* 1358, 84; on *Everyman*, 801, 155.
- Elizabeth, Queen, and her times, 225-8.
- Ellis-Fermor, Una, *The Imagery of 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheists Tragedy'*, 219-20.
- Elson, J. J., *The Non-Shakespearian 'Richard II' and Shakespeare's 'Henry IV'*, Part I, 194, 221.
- Elton, Oliver, *The Nature of Literary Criticism*, 9.
- Elwin, M., *De Quincey*, 328.
- Eminson, T. B. F., *The Place and River Names of the West Riding of Lindsey, Lincolnshire*, 58-9.
- Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature, contributions by H. Whitehall, S. B. Meech, and A. H. Marckwardt, 56-7.
- Everett, A. L., *A Note on Shakespeare's 'Henry VI'*, 193.
- Ewen, Frederic, *The Prestige of Schiller in England*, 12-13; *Bibliography of 18th Century English Literature*, 313.
- Ewing, Fayette C., *Hamlet . . . Psychologic Study*, 186.
- Fabre-Luce, Alfred, *La Vie de D. H. Lawrence*, 341-2.
- Fairley, B., *Selected Passages from 'The Dawn in Britain'*, of Charles Doughty . . . , 335.
- Faust, George Patterson, *Sir Degare: A Study of the Texts and Narrative Structure*, 139-40.
- Fink, Z. S., *Jaques and the Malcontent Traveller*, 184.
- Firth, J. R., on the Second International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 32-3; *The Use and Distribution of certain English Sounds* . . . , 36; *The Technique of Semantics*, 36.
- Fischer, Walther, on *Wanderer*, v. 25 and v. 6-7, 89.
- Flasdieck, H., *Untersuchungen über die germanischen schwachen Verben III. Klasse* . . . , 89-90.
- Fletcher, E. G., *Defoe on Milton*, 257; *A Dryden Anecdote*, 271.
- Flynn, J. G., *The 'Senseless Lure' Problem [I Tamburlaine]*, 208.
- Ford, John, his dramatic art, and dramatic verse, 222-4.

- Forman, Maurice Buxton, *The Letters of John Keats*, ed. by, 325.
- Förster, Max, *Zur i-Epenthese im Altenglischen*, 52-3; on *Alteng. stōr, ein altirisches Lehnwort*, 85.
- Forsythe, R. S., *Terentius Christianus*, 173.
- Fort, J.-B., *Samuel Butler, L'Écrivain: Étude d'un Style*, 333; *Samuel Butler (1835-1902): Étude d'un caractère et d'une intelligence*, 333-4.
- Frampton, Mendal G., *The Date of the 'Wakefield Master'*, 153-4.
- Franz, Wilhelm, *Klangwirkung und Wortstellung*, 37-8; *Metrisch-grammatisches zu Shakespeare's 'King Lear'*, 192.
- Fremantle, Anne, *The Wynne Diaries*, ed. by, 291-2.
- French, J. Milton, *An Action against Milton*, 256-7.
- Freyd, B., and Padelford, F. M., *Spenser or Anthony Munday?* . . . , 241.
- Gabrielson, Arvid, *Elisha Coles's 'Syncrisis'* (1675) as a source of Information on 17th-century English, 54, 281.
- Galsworthy, John, *Life and Letters*, 337-8.
- Galway, Margaret, *Flying in Shakespeare's Comedies*, 182.
- Garman, Douglas, *The Fable of the Bees*, 289.
- Garrett, John, see under Auden, W. H., 26.
- Gaster, T., *Milton and the Rabbinical Bible*, 256.
- George, Mary Dorothy, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* . . . , 312-13.
- Gerould, Gordon Hall, *The Prologue and Four Canterbury Tales*, ed. by, 101; *Arthurian Romance and the Date of the Relief at Modena*, 141.
- Ghosh, J. C., *Annals of English Literature*, 12.
- Gibson, Daniel, Jnr., *On the Genesis of 'Pilgrim's Progress'*, 280.
- Gilbert, Allan H., *Logic in the Elizabethan Drama*, 202.
- Girvan, Ritchie, *Beowulf and the 7th Century*, 73.
- Glunz, H., *Zur Orrmulumfrage*, 126, see under Matthes, H. C., 126.
- Goffin, R. C., *Chaucer and Elocution*, 91-2; *Chaucer: Troilus and Criseyde*, ed. by, 97-8.
- [Gollancz], *Famous Plays of 1935*, 28.
- Gordon, E. V., *Wealthpoew and related names*, 84.
- Gordon, George, *Poetry and the Moderns*, 339-40.
- Gould, Charles, *Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et sur les Voyages* (1728), ed. by, 290-1.
- Gould, Gerald, *Reviewing*, 23-4.
- Gover, J. M., *Literary Associations of the Middle Temple*, 29.
- Gow, Allison, *Is Shakespeare's 'Much Ado' a Revised Earlier Play?*, 193.
- Graff, W. L., *Remarks on the Phoneme*, 35.
- Grattan, J. H. G. and Sykes, C. F. H., *The Owl and the Nightingale*, 127-8.
- Gray, Arthur, *Spenser's Action*, 241; replies by W. L. Renwick, and Kathleen Tillotson, 241.
- Gray, Louis H., on *Glastonbury*, 60.
- Gray, M. M., *Scottish Poetry from Barbour to James VI*, 25.
- Green, F. C., *Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the 18th Century*, 310-12.
- Green, Z. E., *The Observations on the Epic Similes in 'The Faerie Queene'*, 237.
- Greene, Graham, *Rochester and Lee*, 269.
- Greene, Richard Leighton, *The Early English Carols*, ed. by, 132-3.
- Greenlaw, E., see under Heffner, R., 235.
- Greg, W. W., *The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle*, 151-2; see under Salter, F. M., 152-3; *The Manchester Fragment of the Resurrection*, 153; *Christ and the Doctors and the York Play*, 153; *Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, 168, 228; *Roister Doister* . . . , 172-3; answer to J. D. Wilson, 186; *Henry VI and the Contention Plays*, 194; *John Fletcher's Autograph*, 214-15; see under Doran, M., 218.
- Gregor, Joseph, *Shakespeare: Der Aufbau eines Zeitalters*, 178-9.
- Grierson, H. J. C., *The Letters of Sir W. Scott, 1823-1825*, ed. by, assisted by D. Cook, W. M. Parker, and others, 324-5.
- Grierson, John, *The Cinema*, 11.
- Grigson, Geoffrey, *The Arts To-Day*, 10-11.
- Grosse, F., *Das engl. Renaissance-drama im Spiegel zeitgenössischer Staatstheorien*, 224.

- Grubb, Marion, *Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's 'Bradamante'*, 209; *A Brace of Villains*, 209.
- Grube, F. W., *Meat Foods of the Anglo-Saxons*, 88.
- Guppy, Henry, . . . *History of the Transmission of the Bible*, 20-1; *Miles Coverdale and the English Bible*, 167.
- Gurrey, P., *The Appreciation of Poetry*, 28.
- Gwynn, Stephen, *Oliver Goldsmith*, 295-6.
- Haag, Karl, *Das Denkgerüst der Sprache*, 37.
- Haight, Gordon S., *The Source of Quarles's Emblems*, 260, 352; on Quarles's cupbearer-ship to the Queen of Bohemia, 261; on dates of Quarles's secretaryship to Ussher, 261.
- Hall, E. Vine, *The Name Shakespeare at Bishop's Tachbrooke*, 180; *Lettice, Countess of Leicester*, 234.
- Haller, W., *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution 1638-1647*, ed. by, 251-2.
- Ham, Roswell G., *Dryden as Historiographer-Royal: The Authorship of 'His Majesties Declaration Defended'*, 1681, 271; *Dryden's Dedication for 'The Music of the Prophetesse'*, 1691, 271.
- Hammer, Jacob, *Commentary on the Prophetia Merlini*, 141.
- Hammerle, Karl, *Verstreute me. und fröhne. Lyrik*, 134. *While þu hast gode und getest gode . . .*, 134-5.
- Hampden, John, *The Book World*, ed. by, 23-4. Contributions by Stanley Unwin, F. Swinnerton, D. Kilham Roberts, W. G. Taylor, G. Wren Howard, Gerald Gould, J. G. Wilson, Basil Blackwell, J. Ainslie Thin, Charles Nowell, and F. R. Richardson, 23-4.
- Harbage, Alfred, *Elizabethan and 17th-century Play MSS.*, 203; *The Authorship of 'The Christmas Prince'*, 204-5.
- Harder, Hermann, *Ein ags. Sternbild-name*, 47.
- Harris, Brice, *Dorset's Poem 'On the Young Statesmen'*, 273.
- Harrison, B. S., *The Rhetorical Inconsistency of Chaucer's Franklin*, 29.
- Harrison, G. B., *The Background to 'King Lear'* . . . , 191; *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*, 224; see under Rowse, A. L., 224.
- Harrison, Jnr., T. P., *The Latin Pastorals of Milton and Castiglione*, 253.
- Harte, J. L., see under Boarman, J. C., 329.
- Harvey, S. W., *Chaucer's Debt to Sacrobosco*, 94.
- Hastings, William T., *Notes on 'All's Well that Ends Well'*, 193; *A Stern's Goodnight to Shakespeare?*, 198.
- Havens, P. S., *Dryden's 'Tagged' Version of 'Paradise Lost'*, 270.
- Havens, R. D., *Unreconciled Opposites in Keats*, 347.
- Hazard, Paul, *La Crise de la conscience européenne*, 279-80.
- Heath, E., *Pope's Lost Sermon on Glass-Bottles*, 316.
- Heffner, R. S., *Note on Phonologic Oppositions*, 36.
- Heffner, Ray, *The Faerie Queene, Book IV*, ed. by [in *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, ed. by E. Greenlaw, C. E. Osgood, F. M. Padelford], 235; *The Printing of John Hughes's Edition of Spenser*, 1715, 235.
- Henderson, Philip, *Literature*, 10.
- Henderson, W. B. Drayton, *Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' yet deeper in its Tradition*, 196.
- Henry, Myrtle C., *John Trevenna: . . . Romantic Elements . . .*, 336.
- Hepple, R. B., *Terentius Christianus*, 173.
- Herben, Jr., S. J., *The Vercelli Book: a New Hypothesis*, 88-9.
- Hewett-Thayer, W., *Tieck and the Elizabethan Drama: his Marginalia*, 211-12.
- Hiddemann, H., *Geistige Arbeit*, 121.
- Hill, Frank E., *The Canterbury Tales*, . . . into mod. Engl. verse, 100.
- Hinckley, H. B., *The Riddle of the Ormulum*, 126.
- Hinton, E. M., *Ireland through Tudor Eyes*, 226.
- Hintz, H. W., *The Elizabethan Entertainment and 'The Faerie Queene'*, 237.
- Hiscock, W. G., *The Christ Church Missing Books*, 204.
- Hitchcock, Elsie V., *The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, Knight*, . . . by Wm. Roper, ed. by, 163.
- Hittmair, Rudolf, *Zu den Akionsarten im Mittelenglischen*, 54; *Earl Rivers' Einleitung zu einer Übertragung der Weisheitssprüche der Philosophen*, 160-1.
- Hoche, A. E., *Aus der Werkstatt*, 183.

- Hodges, J. C., *On the Date of Congreve's Birth*, 269.
- Hodgkin, R. H., *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, 68-9.
- Holman, L. E., *The Life of Frances Maria Kelly, Actress*, 318.
- Holthausen, Ferdinand, *Ein mitteleng. Gedicht über die Fünf Freuden Marias*, 136.
- Hooker, E. N., *Dryden's Allusion to the Poet of Excessive Wit*, 269.
- Hooper, A. G., *The Auntyrs off Arthure: Dialect and Authorship*, 143.
- Hoops, J., *Kommentar zum Beowulf*, 81.
- Hopkins, G. M., *Letters*, 331-2.
- Horn, W., on OE. *hwæcƿere*, 84-5.
- Horwill, H. W., *A Dictionary of Modern Amer. Usage*, 39-40.
- House, Roy Temple, *Shakespeare and a Poor Swiss Peasant*, 197.
- Houtzager, M. E., *Unconscious Sound- and Sense-assimilations*, 45-6.
- Howard, G. Wren, *Book Production*, 23.
- Howard, Leon, *Early American Copies of Milton*, 257.
- Howarth, R. G., *Some Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset*, 274.
- Howe, Susanne, *Geraldine Jewsbury, Her Life and Errors*, 330.
- Hübener, Gustav, *Beowulf and Germanic Exorcism*, 79-80.
- Hubler, Edward, *The Verse Lining of Q1 of 'King Lear'*, 187.
- Hudson, H. H., *Penelope Devereux as Sidney's Stella*, 233.
- Hudson-Williams, T., *Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar*, 31.
- Hughes, Merritt Y., *Spenser's Palmer*, 238; *John Milton, Paradise Lost*, ed. by, 252-3.
- Hughey, Ruth, *The Harrington MS. at Arundel Castle and Related Documents*, 351.
- Hunt, T. B., *The Scenes as Shakespeare saw them*, 195.
- Hurst, Norman, *Four Elements in Literature*, 8-9.
- Hutcherson, Dudley, *Forged Quartos*, 187-8.
- Hutchings, Gweneth, *Gawain and the Abduction of Guenevere*, 141.
- Iredale, Q., *Thomas Traherne*, 260.
- Jaager, Werner, *Betas metrische Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, 78.
- Jaggard, W., *Words and Meanings: Additions to the 'N.E.D.'*, 43.
- Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie . . . , 30.
- James, A. Lloyd, *The Broadcast Word*, 60.
- James, M. R., on the MSS. of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 70; *The Canterbury Psalter: A Reproduction*, with Introduction by, 120.
- James, Stanley B., *Back to Langland*, 131; *The Neglect of Langland*, 131.
- Janelle, Pierre, *Robert Southwell: the Writer*, 231-2.
- Jenkins, Harold, *On the Authenticity of 'Greene's Groatsworth of Wit' and 'The Repentance of R. Greene'*, 243.
- Jenkins, R., *Newes out of Munster: A Document in Spenser's Hand*, 241.
- Jennings, Humphrey, *Theatre*, 10.
- Jentsch, Heinz G., *Henry More in Cambridge*, 263.
- Jespersen, Otto, *A Few Back-Formations*, 55.
- Jevons, H. Stanley, *Contemporary Models of Sir Thomas More*, 165.
- Jiriczek, Otto L., *Loda in Macpherson's Ossian*, 314; *Zur Bibliographie und Textgeschichte von Hugh Blair's Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian*, 314.
- Johnson, E. C., *Lamb Always Elia*, 319.
- Johnson-Ferguson, Sir Edward, *The Place-names of Dumfriesshire*, 59.
- Johnston, G. B., *Two Notes on Ben Jonson*, 212.
- Joliat, Eugène, *Smollett et la France*, 306-7.
- Joly, A., *William Drummond de Hawthornden, 1585-1649*, 242.
- Jones, C. E., *An Essay on the External Use of Water*, by T. Smollett, 289.
- Jones, Deborah Champion, *Natural History in the Literary Works of Thomas Lodge*, 245.
- Jonson, Ben, stage history, 209-10; in Germany, 210-11; Jonson and Shakespeare, 211-12; *Volpone*, 212.
- Judson, A. O., *A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bp. of Rochester, . . . Relations with Edmund Spenser*, 234-5.
- Jump, J. D., *The Anonymous Masque in MS. Egerton 1994*, 220-1.
- Kahrl, G. M., *The Influence of Shakespeare on Smollett*, 196; *Robert Toft's Annotations in 'The Blazon of Jealousie'*, 247.

- Keck, Wendell Magee, *Accounting for Irregularities in Cloten*, 193.
- Kelcy, Alfred, *Notes on 'Hamlet'*, 190.
- Keller, Wolfgang, *Die Entstehung des Sommernachtstraums*, 193; *Bücherschau*, 197.
- Kelley, Maurice, *Milton's Debt to Wolleb; Milton and the Third Person of the Trinity*, 255; on *De Doctrina Christiana*, 255.
- Kellogg, Eleanor H., *Bishop Brunton and the Fable of the Rats*, 130.
- Kennedy, C. W., *Political Theory in the Plays of Chapman*, 216.
- Kennedy, Virginia W., *S. T. Coleridge: a Selected Bibliography . . .*, compiled by, assisted by Mary N. Barton, 320-1.
- Kindervater, J. W., see under Pollert, H., 197.
- King, Lucille, '2 and 3 Henry VI'—which Holinshed?, 194.
- Kirchner, G., 'To Feed' construed with various objects and prepositions, 62.
- Kirk, Rudolf, *The City-Madam: a Comedy by Philip Massinger*, ed. by, 216-17; *Mr. Pepys upon the State of Christ-Hospital*, 276-7.
- Kirkland, E. C., . . . *Folklore in Milton's English Poems*, 263.
- Kirkwood, A. E. M., *King Richard II*, 194.
- Klaeber, Fr., *Zu alteng. Dichtungen*, 86.
- Knapp, Lewis M., *Smollett and the Case of James Annesley*, 317; *The Publication of Smollett's Complete History and Continuation*, 353.
- Knorr, F., *William Shakespeare*, 180.
- Knowlton, E. C., *Spenser and Nature*, 237.
- Kökeritz, Helge, *English Pronunciation as described in Shorthand systems of the 17th and 18th Centuries*, 54.
- Koller, Kathrine, *Identifications in 'Colin Clout's Come Home Again'*, 241.
- Kostitch, George and Garrido, Isabel, *A Description of English Grammar for Foreign Students*, 61.
- Koszul, A., *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg*, 169-70.
- Koziol, Herbert, *Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch einiger neuenglischen Zeitformen*, 61.
- Krappe, A. H., *Mediaeval Literature and the Comparative Method*, 122-3.
- Kreider, P. V., *Genial Literary Satire in the Forest of Arden*, 182; *Eliza-*
- bethan Comic Character Conventions . . . Comedies of George Chapman*, 215-16.
- Krogmann, Willy, *Aliengl. antid und seine Sippe*, 82; on *Ae. defu*, 85; on *Ae. georman-, geormen-*, 85; on *OE. tō-sōcnung*, 47, 90.
- Krumpelmann, John T., on the American *Hoodlum*, 64.
- Kuersteiner, Agnes D., *E. K. is Spenser*, 239.
- Kurath, Hans, on a projected American Linguistic Atlas, 63.
- Labinski, Marianne, *Shakespeares Komödie der Irrungen: Das Werk und seine Gestaltung auf der Bühne*, 193.
- Lamprecht, S. P., *The Role of Descartes in 17th-Century England*, 280.
- Lange, J. de, *The Relation and Development of English and Icelandic Outlaw-traditions*, 125.
- Langermann, H. von, *Ein Brief des Grafen Wolf Baudissin, über die Vollendung der Schlegel-Tieckschen Shakespeare-Übersetzung*, 197.
- Langland, William, *Piers Plowman in Modern English*, 128-9; 'The Langland Myth', 129-30; 'Chaucer and Langland', 131-2.
- Law, A. R., *Almost damn'd in a fair wife*, 191.
- Lawrence, W. J., *To be or Not to Be: A Revelation*, 186; his answers to J. D. Wilson, 186; *The Original Staging of R. and J. III, V*, 192; *Those Nut-Cracking Elizabethans: . . . Early Theatre and Drama*, 200; *The Empress of Morocco*, 269; *Rochester and Lee*, 269.
- Lawrence, William W., *Satire in Sir Thopas*, 107-8.
- Leathes, Sir Stanley, *Rhythm in English Poetry*, 15-16.
- Leech, Clifford, *The Plays of Edward Sharpham: Alterations Accomplished and Projected*, 221-2.
- Lemmi, Charles W., *Symbolism in 'Faerie Queene' II. 12, 238; Astery's Transformation in 'Muiopotmos'*, 240.
- Leslie, Shane, *The Script of Jonathan Swift and other Essays*, 304-5.
- Lewis, C. S., 'The Genuine Text' [Shakespeare], 186; answer to J. D. Wilson, 186.
- Lightbown, J., *The Prick of Conscience: A collation of MSS. Galba E IX and Harley 4196*, 128.
- Linke, Gerhard, *Der Wortschatz des*

- mitteling. *Epos Genesis und Exodus mit grammatischer Einleitung*, 126-7.
- Linthicum, M. Channing, 'Falding' and 'Medlee', 106.
- Lockert, Lacy, *The Greatest of Elizabethan Melodramas*, 220.
- Longaker, Mark, *Contemporary Biography*, 21.
- Loomis, Laura H., *Chaucer's 'Jewes Werk' and Guy of Warwick*, 108-9.
- Lotspeich, H. G., Spenser's 'Virgil's Gnat' and its Latin Originals, 240; Spenser's *Urania*, 240.
- Lucas, E. V., *The Letters of Charles Lamb*, ... [and] *Mary Lamb*, ed. by, 318-19.
- Luick, Karl, *Zur Palatalisierung*, 52.
- Lyman, Dean B., *The Great Tom Fuller*, 262.
- Lyons, Clifford P., *The Marriage Debate in the 'C. Tales'*, 104-5.
- Lyttton, The Earl of, *Essays by Divers Hands*, contributions by St. John Ervine, H. Hardy Wallis, W. R. Inge, Anthony Deane, Robert L. Ramsey and D. Nichol Smith, 24-5, 347.
- Mabbott, T. O., *Contemporary Evidence for Royal Favour to Milton*, 257.
- Macaulay, T. C., *French and English Drama in the 17th century*, 201, 268.
- McCabe, William K., *Fatum Vortigerni*, 205.
- Macdonald, Angus, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 142.
- McIlwraith, A. K., *The Printer's Copy for 'The City-Madam'*, 217; *A Further Patron of 'The City Madam'*, 217.
- McKeitham, D. M., *Bullen's Beaumont and Fletcher*, 213.
- McKerrow, R. B., *A suggestion regarding Shakespeare's MSS.*, 187.
- McKnight, W. L., *Sir T. Browne of the Religio Medici*, 263.
- McManaway, James G., 'R. III' on the Stage, 196.
- McMaster, Helen N., *Vaughan and Wordsworth*, 259-60.
- McNabb, Vincent, *The Authorship of the Ancren Riwle*, 149; *Saint John Fisher*, 166.
- MacNeice, Louis, *Poetry*, 10.
- Major, J. C., *The Role of Personal Memoirs in English Biography and Novel*, 21.
- Mallet, Sir Charles, *Anthony Hope and his Books*: . . . , 336-7.
- Malone, Kemp, *Herlekin and Herlewin*, 47, 48-9; *Some Linguistic Studies of 1933 and 1934*, 64; on the name *Healfdene*, 82-3; *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*, 138.
- Manchée, W. H., *Samuel Pepys and his Link with the Huguenots*, 277.
- Mandin, Louis, *Shakespeare et les moutons savants*, 197.
- Mangam, Ch. R., *Robert Southwell, and the Council of Trent*, 232.
- Manly, J. M., *Mary Chaucer's First Husband*, 116; see under Millet, F. B., 344.
- Marburg, Clara, *Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn*, 275-6.
- Marckwardt, A. H., *Origin and Extension of the Voiceless Preterite and the P. P. Inflections of the English Irregular Weak Verb Conj.*, 57.
- Marett, R. R., see under Paget, Sir R., 37.
- Marlowe, Christopher, MS. memoranda, 206-7; *Ingram Frizer*, 207-8.
- Marrot, H. V., *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*, 337-8.
- Marshall-Calder, Arthur, *Fiction Today*, 10.
- Martin, Burns, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 192-3.
- Martin, Willard F., *A Chaucer Bibliography*, 1925-33, 117.
- Mathesius, Vilem, *Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts*, 36.
- Matthes, H. C., *Quellenauswertung und Quellenberufung im Ormulum*, 126. See under Glunz, H., 126.
- Matthews, William, *Sailors' Pronunciation in the second half of the 17th Century*, 54, 281; *The Lincolnshire Dialect in the 18th Century*, 56; *Shakespeare and the Reporters*, 187, 351; *Peter Bales, Timothy Bright, and W. Shakespeare*, 187; *Samuel Pepys and Spain*, 277; *Pepys's Transcribers*, 277.
- Matthiessen, F. O., *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot: an Essay on the Nature of Poetry*, 241-2.
- Mavor, Ivan, *Wycherley and St. Paul's School*, 269.
- Mawer, Allen, *Nook-Shotten in 'Henry V'*, 195.
- Maxwell, Baldwin, *The Date of Fletcher's 'The Night-Walker?*, 214; *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*, 214.
- Meech, S. B., *An Early Treatise in English concerning Latin Grammar*, 56-7; on four treatises on Latin Grammar in 15th-century English,

- 157–8; on the 3 English musical treatises in MS. Lansdowne 763, ed. by, 158–9.
- Mézroz, R. L., *Dramatic Verse*, ed. by, 26.
- Meritt, Herbert, on OE. *Ober eliman, innanorum*, 47.
- Meyerstein, E. H. W., *Collins's Ode on Colonel Ross*, 316; *An Essay by Collins*, 316.
- Mezger, F., *Ae.tintreg(a), *tind-treg(a)*, 85–6; *Der germanische Kult und die Ae. Feminina auf -icge und -estre*, 87.
- Mill, Anna J., on craft-accounts for the Bakers' Corpus Christi pageant, 154–5.
- Millett, F. B., *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard II or Thomas of Woodstock*, 221; *Contemporary British Literature: a Critical Survey and 232 Author-Bibliographies*, 3rd ed., revised and enlarged by J. M. Manly and E. Rickert, 344–5.
- Millett, F. B., and Bentley, G. E., *The Art of the Drama*, 18–19.
- Milton, John, personality and art, 252; *De Doctrina Christiana*, 254–6; *Milton's Spelling*, 256; *Blake and Milton*, 307.
- Mitchell, W. Fraser, *A Scots Sermon-Squib*, 262.
- Mohardt, Mathias, *A la recherche de Shakespeare; L'identification de Malvolio*, 197.
- Monk, S. H., *The Sublime: a Study of Critical Theories on 18th-Century England*, 308–9.
- Moore, J. R., *The Contemporary significance of Middleton's 'Game at Chess'*, 217–18.
- Moore, Samuel, Meech, Sanford Brown, and Whitehall, Harold, *ME. Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries* . . . , 42–3.
- Moore Smith, G. C., *Printed Books with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph*, 244.
- More, Paul Elmer, and Cross, Frank Leslie, *Anglicanism . . . the Religious Literature of the 17th Century*, 251.
- More, Sir Thomas, Scholar and writer, 162–3; Roper's *Life*, 163; biographies, 163–4, 166; his models, 65; *Utopia*, 165.
- Moreland, C. C., *Ritson's Life of Robin Hood*, 315.
- Morgan, Charles, *Epitaph on George Moore*, 338–9.
- Morley, Edith J., *The Life and Times of Henry Crabb Robinson*, 318.
- Muir, Kenneth, *Shakespeare's Imagery*, 178.
- Murphy, G. H., *Shakespeare and the Ordinary Man*, 180.
- Murry, John Middleton, *Shakespeare*, 178.
- Myrick, K. O., *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman*, 224.
- Nahm, Milton C., *John Wilson's 'The Cheats'*, ed. by, 266–7.
- Neill, Kerby, *The 'Faerie Queene' and the Mary Stuart Controversy*, 239.
- Nettleton, George H., *Author's Changes in Dryden's Conquest of Granada*, 270; *The School for Scandal*, 316.
- Neuhof, Hans, *Die Calibangestalt in Shakespeare's 'Sturm'*, 193.
- Newton, T. F. M., *William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism*, 315.
- Nicolson, Marjorie, *The Telescope and Imagination*, 250; *The New Astronomy and English Literary Imagination*, 250–1.
- Noble, Richmond, *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer . . .*, 176–8, on dates of *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Othello*, 191.
- Nowell, Charles, *The Public Library*, 24.
- Noyes, R. G., *Ben Jonson on the English Stage, 1660–1776*, 209–10.
- Oakden, J. P., and Innes, Elizabeth R., *Alliterative Poetry in ME. . . .*, 121–2.
- Ockenden, R. E., *John Frampton's Account of the Tobacco-Plant*, 242–3.
- O'Connell, Sir John R., *Saint Thomas More*, 164; *Saint Thomas More as Citizen*, 164.
- O'Connor, D., *The Four Last Things*, ed. by, 165.
- O'Conor, Norreys J., *Godes Peace and the Queenes*, 205–6.
- Oliphant, E. H. C., *Hamlet's Own Lines*, 190; *Tourneur and Mr. T. S. Eliot*, 219.
- O'Loughlin, J. L. N., *The ME. Alliterative 'Morte Arthure'*, 143.
- Oncken, H., *Cromwell: Vier Essays über die Führung einer Nation*, 263.
- Onions, C. T., on 'Sere', 192.
- Osgood, C. E., see under Heffner, R., 235.
- O'Sullivan, Mary J., *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, 140–1.
- Padelford, F. M., see under Heffner, R., 235.

- Page, E. R., *George Colman the Elder, 1732-1794*, 300-1.
- Page, Frederick, *An Essay by Collins*, 316.
- Page, Nadine, *Beatrice: My Lady Disdain*, 184; *The Public Repudiation of Hero*, 184.
- Paget, Sir Richard, *This English*, with a Preface by R. R. Marett, 37.
- Palmer, W. M., *John Sayer (1586-1640) of Shepreth, Cambridgeshire, a 17th-Century Local Historian*, 262; see under Grierson, H. J. C., 324.
- Parker, W. R., *Some Problems in the Chronology of Milton's Early Poems*, 253; *On Milton's Early Literary Programme*, 254; *The Trinity MS. and Milton's Plans for a Tragedy*, 254; *Symmetry in Milton's Samson Agonistes*, 256; *The Kommos of Milton's 'Samson Agonistes'*, 256.
- Parrish, M. L., *A Letter of Charlotte Brontë*, 347.
- Parsons, C. O., *Dryden's Letter of Attorney*, 271.
- Parsons, Edward S., *The Earliest Life of Milton*, 257.
- Patch, Howard R., *Precious Stones in 'The House of Fame'*, 94-5; *The Tradition of Boethius: A Study of his Importance in Medieval Culture*, 123-4.
- Patterson, F. A., and seven associate editors, *The Works of John Milton*, vol. vii, . . . *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* . . . ed. by Clinton W. Keyes, transl. by Samuel Lee Wolff; vols. viii and ix, *Defensio Secunda*, and *Pro se Defensio*, ed. by E. J. Strittmatter, . . . and Moses Hadass; vol. x, *The Hist. of Britain and A Brief Hist. of Moscovia*, ed. by G. P. Krapp; vol. xi, *Artis Logicae Plenior Institutio*, ed. and transl. by Allan H. Gilbert; vols. xiv-xvii, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. by J. H. Hanford and W. H. Dunn, 264.
- Payling, L. W. H., *Geology and Place-names in Kesteven, with map*, 60.
- Pearson, B. R., *Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama*, 201-2.
- Peddie, R. A., *Subject Index of Books ... up to and including 1880; Second Series, A-Z*, 350-1.
- Peers, Sir Charles, a history of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, . . . 70.
- Pellizzi, Camillo, *English Drama*; trans. by Rowan Williams, 17-18.
- Pepys, Samuel, and the navy, 274-5; and *Christ's Hospital*, 276-7; his shorthand, 277-8.
- Phillips, E. M., *Sainte-Beuve et les poètes romantiques anglais*, 347.
- Piccoli, Raffaello, *Otello . . . La Notte dell'Epifania . . . Sogno d'una notte d'estate*, transl. by, and by Aurelio Zanco, and Giulia Celenza respectively, 195.
- Pinto, Vivian de Sola, *Rochester: . . . a Restoration Poet*, 272-3; *The Poetry of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, 273.
- Pirkhofer, A., *Zum syntaktischen Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels bei Caxton*, 150-1.
- Plimpton, George A., *The Education of Chaucer illustrated from the School Books in Use in his Time*, 114-15.
- Pollard, G., see under Brussel, I. R., 350.
- Pollert, Hubert and Kindervater, J. W., *Zeitschriftenscha*, 197-8.
- Pope, Alexander, *Pope's Own Miscellany*, 286-7.
- Potter, Stephen, *Coleridge and S.T.C.*, 319-20.
- Pratt, Robert A., *Chaucer and Boccaccio*, 115.
- Friebisch, R., and Collinson, W. E., *The German Language*, 64-5.
- Probst, Elfriede, *Der Einfluss Shakespeares auf der Stuart-Trilogie Swinburnes*, 196.
- Purcell, J. M., *The Date of 1 Henry IV*, 194; Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella' and Greville's 'Cælica', 233; Gabriel Harvey's Vocabulary, 243.
- Purdie, Edna, see under Robertson, J. G., 21.
- Purdy, R. L., *The Rivals*, ed. by, 287-9.
- Purves, J., *The Dumb-Show in 'Hamlet'*, 190.
- Pyle, Fitzroy, *The Suppressed Edition of A Mirror for Magistrates*, 170; on Hamlet's own lines, 190.
- Quennell, Peter, *Byron: the Years of Fame*, 323.
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, *Felicities of Thomas Traherne*, 260.
- Raby, F. J. E., *A ME. Paraphrase of John of Hoveden's 'Philomena', and the Text of his 'Viola'*, 128.
- Rathlou, Viggo J. von Holstein, *Hesperider og Noble Numre af den Britiske Poët Robert Herrick*, 260.
- Ray, James K., see under Tilley, M. P., 208.
- Raysor, T. M., *The Aesthetic Significance of Shakespeare's Handling of Time*, 182.

SIR HERBERT GRIERSON MILTON AND WORDSWORTH

8s. 6d. net

'The book is what poetry ought to be—it teaches by means of pleasure.'
E. E. KELLETT in the *News Chronicle*.

RARE POEMS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Selected and edited, with brief biographies, by
L. BIRKETT MARSHALL. 7s. 6d. net

An anthology of 200 poems, which will be new to nearly everybody, collected from rare printed books of the Seventeenth Century.

THE SECRET LANGUAGES OF IRELAND

By R. A. S. MACALISTER. 16s. net

Secret languages were used in Ireland both by the Druids and in the early Christian period; and in later times a complete language, Shelta, was in use as a thieves' cant in the underworld. The romantic story of its discovery by C. G. Leland and its analysis by John Sampson is here told; and it is shown to have affinities with the ancient secret languages.

ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association
Volume XVI, 1935. 7s. 6d. net

BYRON Critical and Satirical Poems

With the author's notes

Edited, with additional notes and an introduction, by
JOAN BENNETT. Pitt Press Series. 3s. 6d.

The New Shakespeare KING JOHN

Edited, with an Introduction, by J. DOVER WILSON
With a frontispiece in photogravure. Folio 8vo
Cloth, 6s. net; leather, 10s. 6d. net

HAMLET

Edited, with an Introduction, by J. DOVER WILSON
Second Edition. With a frontispiece in photogravure
8s. 6d. net. Leather 10s. 6d. net

'Will take its place as the most notable edition yet issued.' *The Times Literary Supplement*.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE LETTERS OF WILLIAM AND DOROTHY WORDSWORTH

Edited by E. DE SELINCOURT

THE MIDDLE YEARS, 1806—JUNE 1811. 2 vols.
42s. net

‘...These are the most impressive contribution to our knowledge of Wordsworth since Professor de Selincourt’s edition of “The Prelude”....’
Manchester Guardian.

LETTERS OF HARTLEY COLERIDGE

Edited by G. E. and E. L. GRIGGS

15s. net

‘...The perfection of intimate correspondence, a memorial more lasting than all the acclamation of contemporary criticism....’ ARTHUR WAUGH in the *Fortnightly Review*.

THE NOTE-BOOKS AND PAPERS OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS

Edited by HUMPHRY HOUSE

With many drawings by the poet. 25s. net

‘...This volume intensifies the impression made by Hopkins’s letters published some time ago; that of an inner passion which can be paralleled among modern writers only in the letters of Keats....’ EDWIN MUIR in the *Scotsman*.

THE MIND AND ART OF JONATHAN SWIFT

By RICARDO QUINTANA

16s. net

‘...The most complete and the most scholarly criticism which has yet been devoted to Swift’s art and mind....’ *Times Literary Supplement*.

‘...the most penetrating general study of the mind of Swift which has ever appeared....’ *Ireland To-day*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

SIDGWICK & JACKSON'S ENGLISH TEXTS

General Editor :

A. J. WYATT, M.A.

Each Volume, Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

The introduction and notes of this new series of English Texts are intended rather for those who wish to become acquainted with the works represented as literature than for those whose aim is to study them linguistically. While, therefore, all that is required for the understanding of the text is given, the explanations are as simple and brief as possible.

The following volumes of the series are now ready :

THE LINKS OF THE CANTERBURY TALES, AND THE WIFE OF BATH'S PROLOGUE. Edited by A. J. WYATT, with a Preface by Dr. G. G. COULTON. 3rd impression.

CHAUCER'S PROLOGUE AND NUN'S PRIEST'S TALE. Edited by A. J. WYATT.

'PIERS PLOWMAN.' PROLOGUE AND PASSUS v, vi, vii. Edited by C. D. PAMELY.

SELECTIONS FROM 'LE MORTE D'ARTHUR'. Edited by P. L. BABINGTON. THE PROSE MERLIN. Edited by L. CRANMER-BYNG.

HENRYSON: SELECTED FABLES, &c. Edited by H. M. R. MURRAY. 2nd impression.

SIDGWICK & JACKSON, LTD., 44 MUSEUM STREET, W.C. 1.

BOWES & BOWES

UNIVERSITY BOOKSELLERS

New and Secondhand Books in all Subjects

We have large stocks always available of
BOOKS ON ENGLISH LITERATURE
and of English and Foreign books in all
other subjects

We have special facilities for finding
OUT-OF-PRINT AND SCARCE WORKS
and invite particulars of desiderata

Catalogues and Lists sent free on request

1 & 2 Trinity Street, Cambridge, England

From SIDGWICK & JACKSON'S List

Prefaces to Shakespeare. By HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER.

First Series: LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST—JULIUS CÆSAR—KING LEAR.

With a General Introduction. (*Second Impression.*) 9s. net

Second Series: ROMEO AND JULIET—THE MERCHANT OF VENICE—ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA—CYMBELINE.

(*Second Impression.*). 9s. net.

Third Series: HAMLET. (*Second Impression.*) 10s. 6d. net.

'A notable series.'—*Spectator.*

A CHEAP RE-ISSUE.

Shakespeare : A Survey. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

'We listen to him with delight.... In ten pages Sir Edmund will show more of the quality and uniqueness of a given play of Shakespeare than other men will in a hundred.'—*Times Literary Supplement.*

Present-day Prose. An Anthology of Modern Prose. Chosen and Edited by E. A. GREENING LAMBORN. Containing 256 pages, comprising over sixty selections from the best writers of modern English prose. Cloth, 3s. net. School Edition, 2s. 3d.

Poems of To-day. An Anthology of Modern Poetry. Compiled by THE ENGLISH ASSOCIATION. First and Second Series (sold separately). Stiff paper covers, 2s. each; cloth, with Biographical Notices of Authors, 3s. 6d. net. Also the two series together, on fine paper, buckram binding, 7s. 6d. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net.

Early English Lyrics : Amorous, Divine, Moral, and Trivial. Edited by E. K. CHAMBERS and F. SIDGWICK. Fcap 8vo. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net. *Third Impression.*

The Review of English Studies. Edited by R. B. MCKERROW.

* * * The contributors to Volume XII include, among others, Professor Peter Alexander, Professor E. Bensley, Professor R. Warwick Bond, Professor R. H. Case, Sir E. K. Chambers, Dr. R. W. Chapman, Dr. Mark Eccles, Miss U. Ellis-Fermor, Dr. W. W. Greg, Professor G. Hübener, Professor D. Savrat, Mr. C. L. Wrenn, Professor H. G. Wright. Vols. I-XII, 25s. net each (inland postage 9d., foreign 1s.). Vol. XIII, annual subscription 21s., including postage to any part of the world.

A specimen copy (not current number) will be sent on application to any member of the English Association who mentions this Advertisement.

SIDGWICK & JACKSON, LTD., 44 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

- Read, A. W., *Two New England Word-lists*, 63; *Amphi-Atlantic English*, 63.
- Reade, A. L., *Johnsonian Gleanings*, Part vii; *The Jervis, Porter, and Other Allied Families*, 294.
- Reade, A. R., *Main Currents in Modern Literature*, 344.
- Reaney, P. H., *The Place-names of Essex*, 57-8.
- Reeves, W. Peters, *A Second MS. of Wyclif's "De Dominio Civili"*, 150.
- Reimers, Hans, *Jonathan Swift: Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche*, 303-4.
- Renwick, W. L., on 'Too, too sullied Flesh', 190.
- Rhodes, R. Crompton, *The Early 19th-Century Drama*, 352.
- Richardson, F. R., *The Circulating Library*, 24.
- Rickert, E., see under Millet, F. B., 344.
- Ridley, M. R., *William Shakespeare: A Commentary*, 179; answer to J. D. Wilson, 186; on a 'Pocket Shakespeare', 186; *The New Temple Shakespeare*, 195.
- Roberts, D. Kilham, *The Literary Agent*, 23.
- Roberts, J. H., *The Significance of 'Lamia'*, 347.
- Roberts, S. C., *Doctor Johnson*, 294-5.
- Robertson, J. G., *Essays . . . on Literature*, ed. by Edna Purdie, 21-2.
- Robinson, H. W., and Adams, W., with a Foreword by Sir F. G. Hopkins, *The Diary of Robert Hooke . . .*, ed. by, 278-9.
- Rochester, John Wilmot, Earl of, biography, 272-3, poetry, 273.
- Rohde, Eleanour Sinclair, *Shakespeare's Wild Flowers: Fairy Lore, Gardens, Herbs . . .*, 182-3.
- Rollins, Hyder E., . . . *Sources of Melbancke's Philotimus*, 243; *Thomas Deloney's Euphuistic Learning* and 'The Forest', 244.
- Ronte, Heinz, *Richardson und Fielding: Geschichte ihres Ruhms: Literarsoziologischer Versuch*, 305-6.
- Rosenfeld, Sybil, *The Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660-1700*, 268.
- Ross, A. S. C., *The Runic Stones at Holy Island*, 85; *The Nom. Acc. Sg. Fem. and the Anglo-Frisian Hi-Pronoun*, 89; *The M.E. Poem on the Names of a Hare*, 137-8.
- Ross, Woodburn O., *Another Anologue to The Prioresses Tale*, 107.
- Routh, H. V., *Money, Morals and manners . . . in Modern Literature*, 11.
- Rowse, A. L., and Harrison, G. B., *Queen Elizabeth and her Subjects*, 225.
- Russell, A. J., *Their Religion*, 180.
- Sale, Jnr., W. M., *Samuel Richardson and Sir W. Harrington*, 316.
- Salter, F. M., on 'Of Tyme' [not by Skelton?], 168-9; — and Greg, W. W., *The Trial and Flagellation . . . in the Chester Cycle*, 152-3.
- Saltmarsh, John, *Two Medieval Love-songs set to music*, 135-6.
- Sampson, George, on an imaginary, not real, Hamlet, 190; *The Original Staging of R. and J. III, V*, 192.
- Sampley, A. M., *Peele's 'Decensus Astraeae' and Marlowe's 'Edward II'*, 208.
- Sanders, C. R., *Coleridge as Champion of Liberty*, 347.
- Sargeaunt, M. Joan, *John Ford*, 222-4.
- Sargent, Daniel, *Thomas More*, 163-4.
- Saurat, Denis, *Blake and Milton*, 307.
- Savage, Henry, *A Note on Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 142-3.
- Schirmer, W. F., *Shakespeare und die Rhetorik*, 182.
- Schleck, F. J., *Richardson on the Index*, 316.
- Schröer, Arnold, *Shakespeareana*, 195.
- Schubiger, Maria, *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English*, 60.
- Schücking, Levin L., *The Churchyard scene in Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, 190.
- Schulze, Ivan L., *Elizabethan Chivalry and the Faerie Queene's Annual Feast*, 237.
- Scott, Sir S. H., *The Exemplary Mr. Day, 1748-1789*, 302-3.
- Seaton, Ethel, *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the 17th Century*, 200-1, 249-50.
- Sedgefield, W. J., *Beowulf*, ed. by, [3rd ed.], 74-6.
- Selincourt, E. de, *The Early Letters of W. and Dorothy Wordsworth*, 322-3; see also under Williams, C., 26.
- Sells, A. Lytton, *The History of Francis Wills: A Literary Mystery*, 316.
- Sergeantson, Mary, *A History of Foreign Words in English*, 43-5; assisted by Leslie N. Broughton, *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, ed. by, 353.

- Severs, J. Burke, *The Source of Chaucer's 'Melibeus'*, 109–10.
- Sewell, Arthur, *Milton and the Mosaic Law*, 255–6.
- Shackford, M. H., *E. B. Browning, R. H. Horne . . .*, 328–9.
- Shafer, R., *Paul Elmer More and American Criticism*, 345–6.
- Shakespeare, William, his 'life-work', 178; artistry, 180–3; backgrounds, 178–9; sources, 195–6; stage-problems, 192–3, 195–6; bibliography, 197–8; *Imagery*, 175–8; *Hamlet*, 177–91; 'The Jew', 184–5; *Lear*, 187, 191–2; *Othello*, 191; Falstaff, 185, 194.
- Sharpe, R. B., *Title-Page Mottoes in the Poetomachia*, 213; *The Real War of the Theatres . . .*, 224.
- Shaw, Margaret, *Letters of Laurence Sterne*, 316.
- Shellabarger, Samuel, *Lord Chesterfield*, 296–7.
- Shepherd, T. B., *John Wilkes in the Strand*, 316.
- Sherburn, G., *Pope's Lost Sermon on Glass-Bottles*, 316.
- Shillinglaw, A. T., on *Leviathan* originally chiefly in English, 262.
- Shine, H., *Carlyle and the German Philosophy Problem*, 1826–7, 347.
- Simmons, E. J., *English Literature and Culture in Russia*, 13–14.
- Simpson, Percy, *Proof-Reading in the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries*, 348.
- Skeat, Walter, *Milton's Lament for Damon and his other Latin Poems . . . into English*, with Preface and Introductions by E. H. Visiak, 253.
- Skillan, George, *The Merchant of Venice . . .*, 195.
- Slover, Clark H., *Glastonbury Abbey and the Fusing of English Literary Culture*, 123.
- Slovsky, V., *Considérations théoriques sur la conception d'un Dictionnaire*, 43.
- Small, Miriam Rossiter, *Charlotte Ramsay Lennox: an 18th Century Lady of Letters*, 302–3.
- Small, G. W., *Shakespeare's Stage*, 195.
- Small, S. A., *The Influence of Seneca*, 196.
- Smith, A. H., *The Parker Chronicle*, ed. by, 76–7; *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, 87–8.
- Smith, Charles G., *Spenser's Theory of Friendship . . .*, 238; *Sententious Theory in Spenser's Legend of Friendship*, 238–9.
- Smith, David Nichol, *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, 283–4.
- Smith, F. A., *The Light Reading of Dr. Johnson*, 316.
- Smith, F. M., *The Relation of Coleridge's 'Ode on Dejection' to Wordsworth's 'Ode on Intimations of Immortality'*, 347.
- Smith, George, *The Coronation of Elizabeth Wydeville*, 160.
- Smith, Janet Adam, *Poems of Tomorrow: an Anthology of Contemporary Verse . . . from 'The Listener'*, ed. by, 346.
- Smith, Logan Pearsall, *Fine Writing*, 28–9.
- Smith, Mary Frances, *Wisdom and Personification . . . in ME. Literature*, 124–5.
- Smith, Richard Lawrence, *John Fisher, and Thomas More . . .*, 166.
- Smith, Robert, M., *An Interesting First Folio*, 187; *The Folger Folios*, 187.
- Smith, Roland M., *Spenser's Irish River Stories*, 237; *Una and Duessa*, 238.
- Smith, W. G., with Introd. and Index by Janet E. Heseltine, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs*, 40–1.
- Smith-Dampier, J. L., *Who's Who in Boswell?*, 303.
- Smyser, H. M., and Stroup, T. B., *Analogues to the Mak Story*, 154.
- Snyder, F. B., *Burns and the Smuggler Rosamund*, 315.
- Sorensen, Fred, *The Masque of the Muscovites*, in *L.L.L.*, 192.
- South, Helen Pennock, 'The Question of Halsam', 137.
- Spencer, Hazelton, *The Undated Quarto of 'I Honest Whore'*, 213.
- Spender, Stephen, *The Destructive Element*, 242–3.
- Spenser, Edmund, platonism, 236; *Faerie Queene*, 237–9.
- Sperry, W. L., *Wordsworth's Anti-Climax*, 321–2.
- Spira, Theodor, *Zum Wesen des Puritanismus*, 248.
- Sprague, Arthur Colby, *Shakespeare and the Audience . . .*, 181.
- Spurgeon, C. F. E., *Shakespeare's Imagery . . .*, 175–8.
- Squire, Sir John, *Reflections and Memories*, 22–3; *Flowers of Speech*, 23; *Shakespeare as a Dramatist*, 180–1.
- Stahl, E. L., and Anders, Erika, *Theaterschau*, 198.

- Stamm, Rudolf, *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes*, 305.
- Starke, Fritz, *Populäre engl. Chroniken des 15. Jts. . . .*, 146-8.
- Staubert, Paul, *Thomas Chatterton und seine Rowley-Dichtung untersucht auf Grund der Psychologie der Reifezeit*, 301.
- Steadman, Jnr., J. M., *A Study of Verbal Taboos*, 37; *Language Taboos of American College Students*, 37.
- Steck, Paul, *Schiller und Shakespeare*, 197.
- Stevenson, Hazel A., *A Possible Relation between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth*, 115.
- Stewart, George R., *English Geography in Malory's 'Morte D'Arthur'*, 144-5.
- Stirling, Brents, *Two Notes on the Philosophy of 'Mutabilitie'*, 239.
- Stoll, E. E., *The Dramatic Texture of Shakespeare*, 182; *Oedipus and Othello*: Corneille, Rymer and Voltaire, 182; *Hamlet the Man*, 185-6; *The Date of 'The Malcontent'*; *A Rejoinder*, 220.
- Strachan, L. R. M., *Flaed in A.-S. Names*, 48.
- Strathmann, E. A., *Lady Carey and Spenser*, 235.
- Straumann, Heinrich, *Newspaper Headlines . . .*, 61.
- Stroup, T. B., see under Smyser, H. M., 154; *'The Princess of Cleve'* and *Sentimental Comedy*, 269.
- Sturgiss, Marie H., *Shakespeare's Miranda*, 184.
- Summers, Montague, *The Playhouse of Pepys*, 265-6; *A Bibliography of the Restoration Drama*, 266.
- Summerson, John, *Architecture*, 11.
- Süsskand, P., *Geschichte des unbestimmen Artikels im Alt- und Frühmittelenglischen*, 55.
- Sutherland, J. R., *A Note on the Last Years of Defoe*, 314; *The Beggar's Opera*, 316.
- Swadesh, Morris, *Twaddell on Defining the Phoneme*, 35; *The Vowels of Chicago English*, 64.
- Swaen, A. H., *Malapropism*, 55-6.
- Swift, Jonathan, *Letters*, 282-3; *The Drapier's Letters*, 285-6; his script, 304-5.
- Swinnerton, F., *The Georgian Scene: a Panorama*, 343-4.
- Tannenbaum, S. A., *Classified Bibliography*, 197; *Editorial Notes on 'Wit and Science'*, 171.
- Tatlock, J. S. P., *The Date of the 'Troilus' and Minor Chauceriana*, 98-9, 105; *The Canterbury Tales in 1400*, 101-3.
- Taylor, G., *Notes on Athelston*, 139.
- Taylor, Marion A., *How Falstaff brought Holinshed up to date*, 194.
- Ten Hoor, G. J., *Ben Jonson's Reception in Germany*, 210-11.
- Tenney, E. A., *Thomas Lodge*, 244-5.
- Thaler, Alwin, *Shakespeare and Spenser*, 195-6.
- Thin, J. Ainslie, *Bookselling*, 24.
- Thomas, Gilbert, *William Cowper and the 18th Century*, 298-9.
- Thomas, Sidney, *Wolsey and French Farces*, 172.
- Thompson, A. Hamilton, *Bede, his Life, Times and Writings*, ed. by, 69-71. [Contains 11 essays.]
- Thompson, C. R., *A Note on Nicholas Chaucer*, 116.
- Thompson, Edward, Sir Walter Raleigh, 245-6; on *The Tudor Character*, 246.
- Thomson, S. Harrison, *The Date of the Early English Translation of the 'Candet Nudatum Pectus'*, 137.
- Thornton, R. H., *American Glossary*, 63.
- Thorpe, Clarence D., . . . *Dennis and Addison on Mountain Scenery*, 280-1.
- Tibble, J. W., *The Poems of John Clare*, ed. by, 325.
- Tickell, R. E., *Pope and Tickell*, 316.
- Tilley, M. P., *The Marriage of Wit and Science*, 171; — and Ray, J. K., *Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions*, 208.
- Tillotson, G., *Rasselas and the Persian Tales*, 316.
- Tillyard, E. M. W., on C. S. Lewis's 'The Personal Heresy in Criticism', 24; see under Williams, C., 26.
- Timberlake, P. W., *Milton and Euripides*, 256.
- The Times*, *The History of, . . . 1785-1841*, 19-20.
- Tinker, C. B., *Arnold's 'Dover Beach'*, 347.
- T. L. S., leading articles, *Hooke, Theodore, and his Diary*, 279; *Pastoral Plays*, 201; *Quatercentenary of the Coverdale Bible*, 167-8; *Sir W. Raleigh's Prose*, 246; *The Tudor Character*, 170, 246; *John Fisher and Thomas More*, 166.
- Toynbee, Paget, and Whibley, Leonard, *The Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, ed. by, 284-5.

- Train, Lilla, *Chaucer's 'Ladyes Foure and Twenty'*, 114.
- Tramer, Irma, *Studien zu den Anfängen der puritanischen Emblemliteratur in England*, 242.
- Traver, Hope, *Beowulf* 648-9, 80.
- Treneer, Anne, *Charles M. Doughty: a Study of his Prose and Verse*, 334-5.
- Trnka, B., *Phonological Analysis of Present-Day Standard English*, 33-4.
- Trubetzkoy, N., *Anleitung zu phonologischen Beschreibungen*, 36.
- Trusler, Margaret, *Some Textual Notes based on . . . the Towneley MS.*, 154.
- Turnell, G. M., *Dryden and the Religious Elements in the Classical Tradition*, 271.
- Tuve, Rosemond, *Spenser and the 'Zodiake of Life'*, 236-7.
- Twaddell, W. F., *On Defining the Phoneme*, 34-5.
- Vachek, Josef, *Several thoughts on several Statements of the Phoneme theory*, 35.
- Vaganay, Hugues, *L'Œuvre d'un évêque français traduite par Josuah Sylvester*, 242.
- Vandiver, Jr., E. P., *Elizabethan Dramatic Parasite*, 202.
- Veen, H. R. S. van der, *Jewish Characters in 18th-Century English Fiction and Drama*, 307-8.
- Villard, Léonie, *Les 'Juvenilia' de Jane Austen*, 347.
- Vinaver, Eugène, *Malory's Morte Darthur in the Light of a Recent Discovery*, 143-4.
- Vincent, H. P., *A Pope Problem*, 316.
- Visiak, E. H., see under Skeat, W., 253.
- Visser, G. J., *Lazamon: An Attempt at Vindication*, 145.
- Volbeda, R., *The 'Definite Forms'*, 61-2.
- Vulliamy, C. E., *Aspasia: The Life and Letters of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany (1700-1788)*, ed. by, 292.
- Wager, Willis J., *The So-called Prologue to the Kts.' Tale*, 106.
- Wagner, Bernard M., *New Songs of the Reign of H. VIII*, 169; *New Poems by Sir E. Dyer*, 170-1; *A Middleton Forgery*, 218.
- Walcutt, Charles Child, *The Pronoun of Address in 'Troilus and Criseyde'*, 99.
- Waldock, A. J., *Some Recent Developments in English Literature: Lectures*
- on J. Joyce, E. Sitwell, and T. S. Eliot, 341-2; on *Ulysses*, 342.
- Wales, Julia Grace, *Elaboration of Setting in 'Othello'* . . . , 191.
- Walker, R. D., *Letters . . . to Mrs. Gaskell . . . in the possession of the John Rylands Library*, ed. by, 330.
- Wallenberg, J. K., *The Place-names of Kent*, 58.
- Wallerstein, Ruth C., *The Development of the Rhetoric and Metre of the Heroic Couplet*, 257-8; *Richard Crashaw: . . . Style and Poetic Development*, 258.
- Walley, Harold H., *Shakespeare's Portrayal of Shylock*, 184-5.
- Warburg Institute, *Kultursissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike*, ed. for, 11-12.
- Ward, C. E., *on Tyrannic Love, or the Royal Martyr*, 270.
- Wardale, E. E., *Chapters on O.E. Literature*, 66-8.
- Warne, F. J., *Prester John in Coleridge's 'Kubla Khan'*, 347.
- Warren, Austin, *Carmen Deo Nostro*, 259; *on Richard Crashaw's ordination*, 259.
- Wasilefsky, A. M., *John Donne the Rhetor*, 263.
- Wassenburg, Rudolf, *Tolstois Angriff auf Shakespeare: Ein Beitrag zur Charakterisierung östlichen und westlichen Schöpfertums*, 197.
- Watkins-Jones, A., *Bishop Percy, Thomas Warton, and Chatterton's Rowley Poems*, 315.
- Watson, George, *The Designation of an Atmospheric Phenomenon*, 48.
- Watts, H. H., *Lytton's Theories of Prose Fiction*, 347.
- Waugh, Evelyn, *Edmund Campion*, 232-3.
- Weatherly, Edward H., *A Note on Chaucer's Pardoners' Prologue*, 113-14.
- Webster, C. M., *The Satiric Background of the attack on the Puritans in Swift's 'A Tale of a Tub'*, 280, 315-16.
- Weekley, Ernest, *Something about Words*, 46-7; *Etymology of 'Codlin'*, 47-8.
- Weigelin, E., *Hamlets Verschickung nach England*, 190.
- Weiss, R., *A Letter-Preface of John Free to John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester*, 161.
- Weitzmann, F. T., *Notes on the Elizabethan 'Elegie'*, 231.
- Wells, H. G., *Utopia . . . by Sir T.*

- More and . . . into English by Ralph Robinson*, introduction by, 165.
- Wells, J. E., *Sixth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in ME.*, 1050–1400, 121.
- Wells, W. S., *The Famous Victories of H. V.*, 224.
- Welsford, Enid, *The Fool*, 16–17.
- Wershofen, Christian, *James Harrington und sein Wunschschild vom germanischen Staate*, 263.
- West, Michael, *The New Method English Dictionary*, 41.
- Whibley, Leonard, see under Toynbee, Paget, 284.
- White, H. O., *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance* . . ., 238–30.
- Whitehall, Harold, *Some 15th-Century Spellings from the Nottingham Records*, 15; on *Bask*, 47; *The Background of the verb Bask*, 49–50; *Scaitcliffe, a Place-name Derivation*, 56.
- Whitford, Harold C., *A New Document concerning Robert Chaucer*, 116.
- Whiting, B. J., *Proverbs in the 'Ancren Riwle' and the 'Recluse'*, 148–9.
- Whiting, C. E., on Bede's life and works, 71.
- Whiting, G. W., *Milton's Reply to Lord Digby*, 253; *Milton and that 'learned English Writer'*, 253–4; *Milton and the 'Postscript'*, 254; *The Source of Eikonoklastes: A Resurvey*, 254.
- Whiting, Mary B., *Sir Thomas More*, 165.
- Whitney, Lois, *Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the 18th Century*, 314.
- Wiehe, Heinrich, *Piers Plowman und die sozialen Fragen seiner Zeit*, 131.
- Wild, Friedrich, *Zum Problem des Barocks in der englischen Dichtung*, 249.
- Wilkinson, C. H., *A Note on Thomas May*, 262; *Lord Rochester*, 273.
- Willard, R., *Two Apocrypha in OE. Homilies*, 77–8.
- Williams, Charles, *Rochester*, 272–3; — and Cecil, Lord David, Selincourt, E. de, and Tillyard, E. M. W., *The New Book of English Verse*, ed. by, 26.
- Williams, F. B., *Ingram Frizer*, 207–8; *The Massacre of Money* (1602), 241; *Leicester's Ghost*, 241–2; *The Haven of Hope*, 243.
- Williams, Harold, *Jonathan Swift and the Four Last Years of the Queen*, 351–2; *A Swift Epitaph*, 316; *The Drapier's Letters*, 316.
- Williams, Marjorie, William Shenton . . ., 297–8.
- Williams, Rowan, see under Pellizzi, C., 17.
- Williamson, George, *Hakewill and the Arthurian Legend*, 141–2; *Mutability, Decay, and 17th-Century Melancholy*, 249; *Of Milton and the Mortalist Heresy*, 254–5.
- Wilson, J. D., on the 'complete' *Hamlet*, 186; *What Happens in 'Hamlet'*, 188–9; *Too too sullied Flesh*, 190.
- Wilson, R. M., *The Provenance of the Lambeth Homilies with a New Collation*, 149–50; $\bar{æ}$ and $\bar{æ}^2$ in ME., 150.
- Wine, Celesta, *Nathaniel Wood's Conflict of Conscience*, 173–4.
- Withington, R., *Water fastand*, 154; *The Castle of Perseverance*, l. 695, 155; *The Continuity of Dramatic Development*, 181.
- Wohlers, Heinz, *Der persönliche Gehalt in den Shakespeare-Noten Samuel Johnsons*, 197–8.
- Wolff, Max I., *Shakespeare und sein Publikum*, 181.
- Woodbridge, J. E., *Locke's Essay*, 280.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P., *Puritanism and Liberty*, 248; *Milton, Puritanism and Liberty*, 248.
- Wordsworth, William, his decline, 321–2; *Letters to Dorothy*, 322–3.
- Worrall, Walter, *Titus Andronicus*, 'that painted hobby', 192.
- Wright, Elizabeth M., *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 142.
- Wright, Herbert G., *An Early Allusion to Chaucer*, 117; *Greene's 'Ridstall Man'*, 208–9; *Was George Herbert the Author of 'Jacula Prudentium'?*, 258.
- Wright, Louis B., *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, 226.
- Wroot, H. E., *Sources of Charlotte Brontë's Novels, Persons and Places*, 328.
- Wurtzbaugh, Jewel, *Thomas Edwards and the Editorship of the 'Faerie Queene'*, 235–6; *Digby's Criticism of Spenser*, 237.
- Wyld, H. C., *The Significance of 'n' and -en in Milton's Spelling*, 53, 256.

- Yearsley, M., *The Diary of the Visits of John Yeoman to London in the Years 1774 and 1777*, ed. by, 292.
- Young, G. M., on 'Too too sullied Flesh', 190.
- Young, Karl, *A Note on Chaucer's Friar*, 105; *The Interpretation of a Passage in 'Hamlet'*, 191.
- Zachrisson, R. E., Uncomponed Low-German -ing- names containing Personal Names, 59; English Place- name Compounds containing Descriptive Names in the Genitive, 59.
- Zanco, Aurelio, see under Piccoli, R., 195.
- Zettl, Edward, *An Anon. Short English Metrical Chronicle*, ed. by, 145-6.
- Zimmermann, Jane, *Phonetic Transcription*, 64.
- Züldsdorff, Harold, *Die Technik des komischen Zwischenspiels der frühen Tudorzeit*, 171-2.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



128 320

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY